MARCH 1952

PRICE 1s. 6d. NET.

The Expository Times

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY

JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITORS

A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.

Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

Contents

PAGE

I. THE CENTENARY OF JAMES HASTINGS—
THE MAN AND THE EDITOR By Professor Emeritus A. I GOSSIP, D.D., LL.D., Kingussie, Inverness-shire . . . 161
THE DICTIONARIAN. By Principal WILLIAM FULTON, D.D., LL.D., Trinity College, Glasgow 162

II. NOTES OF RECENT EXPOSITION—Dr C. H. Dodd on New Testament Ethics—Moral Instruction of the Early Christian Teachers—Can the Ethic of Christ be Regarded as a New Law?—Ought the Conception of Sacrifice to Enter into Eucharistic Worship? 165

III. LITERATURE 167

IV CONCERNING THE NEW TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE By the Reverend JOHN K. S. REID, B.D., Edinburgh 172

V THE MEANING OF THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT. By Professor A. M. HUNTER, Ph.D., D.Phil., D.D., Aberdeen 176

VI. IN THE STUDY—
1. Virginibus Puerisque 180
2. The Christian Year 181

VII. A DOCUMENT ON REUNION By Professor H. G. WOOD, D.D., Birmingham . . . 190

VIII. CONTRIBUTIONS AND COMMENTS—
1. Go and Make Ready. By Professor JOHN FOSTER, D.D., Glasgow . . . 193
2. Demoniac of Gadara By Canon W J. CRATCHLEY, B.Litt., Ph.D., Swindon . 193
3. Translation and the Preacher. By the Reverend THOMAS M. DONN, M.A., Duthil, Inverness-shire . . . 194

IX. RECENT FOREIGN THEOLOGY. By Professor H. H. ROWLEY, D.D., Manchester . 194

X. ENTRE NOUS—New Series—Stephen Hobhouse—Florence Allshorn 196

VOLUME LXIII. No. 6

38 GEORGE ST. : T. & T. CLARK : EDINBURGH

EDITORIAL AND ADVERTISING OFFICES, KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN

PREACHING IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE

By ERIC C. RUST, M.A., B.D., M.Sc.
Senior Tutor, Rawdon Baptist College

This is the Fifth Joseph Smith Memorial Lecture by a scholar who is both a scientist and a theologian. It will be of great value in enabling preachers to preach the Gospel of Christ with greater power in our scientific age.

Previous Lectures still available :

THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS
By WILLIAM ROBINSON, M.A., D.D.

SOME LESSONS FROM MARCION
By PERCY W. EVANS, D.D.

Available from

THE SECRETARY
OVERDALE COLLEGE, SELLY OAK
BIRMINGHAM, 29

1s. 6d. per copy, plus 1½d. postage.

Distinctive Printing

WILL ALWAYS APPEAL!

We shall be pleased to submit suggestions for your **PRINTING** and **PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS**

Write for particulars now to

MORRISON & GIBB Ltd.
PRINTERS • • BOOKBINDERS
TANFIELD, EDINBURGH

W. & A. K. JOHNSTON Ltd.
LITHOGRAPHERS • MAP PRINTERS
EDINA WORKS, EASTER ROAD, EDINBURGH

New Books

Your God is Too Small

By J. B. PHILLIPS — *7s. 6d. net*

The trouble with many people to-day is that they have not found a God big enough for their needs. The challenge of modern utilitarian society and of scientific thought leaves them feeling helpless in an unfriendly world. Yet the God who supplieth all men's needs is there: and the author brings to the true description of that God the same freshness of writing and perception which characterises his translations of St. Paul in *Letters to Young Churches*. This is an unusual book, and one which will repay thoughtful reading.

Noughts and Crosses

By WILFRED SHEPHERD — *6s. net*

This is the title of the first sermon of a number which the author has chosen as representative of the things which he has counted it good to preach over a number of years. This first sermon is typical of them all: for a very few lines bring the reader to the heart of its subject, *via* the symbols of the circle and the cross.

Divine and Human

By E. L. ALLEN, D.D., Ph.D. — *6s. net*

'Is God separated from the world's sin by a gulf so great that it can only be bridged by Divine Grace? Or is there a continuity, and likeness, between Creator and creature?'— These questions are basic and utterly fundamental to everything that we think about life. We commend this book to all who seek to make a living reality of their faith in terms of the present-day world and the demands which we can never ignore.

Praying Together

By RUPERT E. DAVIES, M.A., B.D. — *6s. net*

These prayers and suggestions are suitable for use in churches, schools, fellowship groups and youth clubs, and at family worship. They will especially help people 'to pray with the spirit' and to 'pray with understanding also.'

Children Who Knew Jesus

By YVONNE ST. CLAIRE — *5s. net*

Many children met the Master—the nobleman's son, the boy with the loaves and fishes, and Jairus's daughter. The author has imagined other children, surely typical of those who saw and heard Him long ago. The stories, where possible, follow chronological order. The writer has taken care not to attribute to Jesus words or actions unauthorised by Holy Writ, and she seeks to show how the meeting with Jesus affected every part of these lives.

NEW EDITIONS NOW AVAILABLE

TODAY. A Book of Devotions.
By RITA F. SNOWDEN — *Illustrated* — *6s. net*

A BUNCH OF EVERLASTINGS. A Book of Essays.
By F. W. BOREHAM, D.D. — *6s. net*

THE EPWORTH PRESS
25-35 CITY ROAD :: LONDON, E.C.1

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

James Hastings

The Man and the Editor

By Professor Emeritus A. J. Gossip, D.D., LL.D., Kingussie, Inverness-shire

James Hastings, the centenary of whose birth falls on March 26, was a remarkable man, with notable achievements to his credit. Most of us dream our dreams, but, for the most part, little comes of them. Because we do not possess the gifts or the determination to work them out. But Hastings' dreams came true. Young and quite unknown, and settled in a somewhat isolated parish, he, single-handed, planned and boldly launched a theological magazine, a sufficiently daring venture. Yet almost all the features of The Expository Times, as we know it, were present from the very start. At first its circulation was mainly local and precarious. And then fortune smiled. For that distinguished Edinburgh publishing house, T. & T. Clark, adopted the fledgling paper, and so began that friendship between publishers and editor to which we owe so much. They believed in each other, and trusted each other to an audacious degree. They took large risks, so sure were they of one another. And if the publishers deserve grateful recognition of their courage, and it was courage, Hastings, too, threw in all that he had.

He was a man of many gifts; not the least of them a winsome personality—human, humorous, and interested in all kinds of unexpected things; cricket, for instance. On occasion he would travel to England to watch a county match or two; and so home again. A singularly modest man, as most great souls are, he could sit among his friends, silent, alert, interested, following it all closely with that shrewd appraising glance of his, but saying almost nothing. In that he resembled James Moffatt. Both had to be coaxed into speech, though, once they started, there was usually something worth the hearing. Too honest to pretend, if Hastings differed from you he said so candidly and with point. And usually he was right. Yet by nature the man was a great encourager, quick to commend and praise, and slow to criticise. There must be many who can say of him what Johnson said of Warburton: 'He praised me at a time when praise was of value to me.' To many a man he gave his chance, and coaxed him into a fullness of life he might have missed.

He himself was a terrific worker, with an orderly mind that saved him much labour. But schemes kept forming in his brain, and were adopted by the publishers.

An avid reader, he possessed a library of fifty to sixty thousand volumes, and masses of others were constantly distributed to reviewers and the like. Books filled his spacious house. They lined the walls of room on room. And, in addition, an entire flat was shelved and filled with the masterpieces of theology and literature. Probably he had the finest collection of works on Comparative Religion in private hands. What Boswell's uncle said of Johnson was no less true of Hastings —'A robust genius born to grapple with whole libraries.'

For he used his books, could tear the heart out of them, and set it down in print; a difficult thing to do. Yet he did it month by month in The Expository Times.

Genius is not a word to be tossed about at haphazard and indiscriminatingly. But there was more than a touch of genius in Dr. Hastings' editing. Think of the toil involved in such an undertaking as *The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. The initial planning of it, the choice of subjects so that none be lacking, the allotting of them to the right man, the keeping of them to time, which Hastings told me he found not an easy task, the corroborating of the quotations, and so on. It makes one tired even to think of it. Yet, with an admirable staff, Hastings surefootedly carried it through with a thoroughness that is impressive. He had helpers, two in especial. The one that gracious lady his wife, with her remarkable knowledge of theology and literature. Hastings

himself admitted how much he owed to her. And the other? That humble spirit, Professor Selbie, who gave eagerly and generously of his best; and a fine best it was. But Hastings accomplished what he did because he was Hastings. A devout man, he appeared twice a Sunday in church and worshipped God humbly and seriously. I remember saying thirty years ago in his funeral sermon that when I had a particularly disappointing sermon, my first thought on reaching the pulpit was to look if he were in his place, not hoping that he would be away. Quite the reverse. For such an ardent worshipper would greatly help to pull things through. At the Scriptures he listened as if he had never heard it before, and at the sermon he leaned forward, as if one were preaching straight to him. And that devoutness he wove into his daily work, doing it all for the Lord Christ.

The world never stands still. But sometimes it moves faster and more noticeably than at others. Hastings was born into a day when between the old and the new a huge gulf yawned. In Britain we have managed better than in some other countries. And we owe it to our scholars. 'Teacher,' one asked of Christ, 'what is the greatest commandment in the Law?' And He replied, 'You must love the Lord your God with your whole heart, with your whole soul, and with your whole mind.' Our scholars have helped us to be sincere and yet believing, to love God with our mind. And not the least of these was James Hastings.

James Hastings

The Dictionarian

By Principal William Fulton, D.D., LL.D., Trinity College, Glasgow

There have been few personal loyalties in my life, but undoubtedly one of them has been given to James Hastings. I met him only a few times, and it was toward the close of his career, but I was so impressed and captured by his personality—his sincerity and goodness, his devotion to the mighty tasks he had so courageously conceived, his gentleness, courtesy, and friendliness—that had time and circumstance been favourable I had seized every chance of deepening my acquaintance with him. However, after his death (on 15th October 1922, the revised proofs of the November issue of this magazine at his bedside) his family did me the honour of enlisting my help in the columns of the magazine; and it was then I realized how large a place he held in my affection and esteem. To contribute to The Expository Times month by month for some thirty years has been to forgo other projects, but it has brought me real satisfaction, and only increased my sense of loyalty to him.

When he died, the great projects of dictionary-making to which he had set his hand had reached their completion, but the question was asked in accents of despair: Who will carry on The Expository Times? His family have supplied the answer. In applauding the success of the present editors' resolution and enterprise, which have maintained the great influence of this magazine throughout another generation, I cannot but express the hope that their happy co-operation may long continue.

When I went to Aberdeen in 1915 Hastings had accomplished the greater part of his dictionary-making. His famous *Dictionary of the Bible* in four volumes had appeared between 1898 and 1902, and the Extra Volume in 1904. The fundamental aim was to equip the modern preacher for his work by enabling him to combine evangelical teaching with the results of Biblical criticism; the preacher should have zeal with knowledge. It was in pursuance of this aim that the Extra Volume was published, showing comparatively few contributors but containing—besides the useful Indexes to the whole work—many substantial articles (though none approximating in length to Kautzsch's of a hundred and twenty-one pages on 'The Religion of Israel').

In common with the editors of the rival dictionary, 'The Encyclopædia Biblica' (1899–1903), Hastings made a point of including articles on Biblical Theology, to show the movement of religious life and thought within the Jewish and the Christian Church. One reason why his

Dictionary has become the more popular of the two is that his sympathies were with 'moderate' as distinguished from 'advanced' criticism, and the preacher tends to favour 'moderate' criticism unless he be under some compelling conviction.

Four years after the Extra Volume appeared Hastings published his single-volume *Dictionary of the Bible*. Where purses were slender, or life unleisured, or academic equipment meagre, it made special appeal. Yet for scholarly worth the single-volume *Dictionary* stands high among all similar works published before or since.

It is another indication of Hastings' interest in the proper equipment of the Christian preacher (he was himself a notable preacher during his ministries at Kinneff, Dundee, and St. Cyrus) that he was not content to leave the subject of 'Jesus Christ' in the form of a dictionary article (W. Sanday's of fifty-one pages, the longest article in the first four volumes of the *Dictionary*). In 1906 he issued the first volume of *The Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* and in 1908 the second volume, a preacher's dictionary to which preachers who were also scholars contributed. It was hailed by W. Robertson Nicoll as 'a triumphant and unqualified success.' Hastings liked to recall that one of the best articles was T. B. Kilpatrick's on 'The Character of Christ.'

Driven alike by the zeal of his spirit and the logic of his mind, Hastings proceeded to do for the rest of the New Testament what he had done for the Gospels, and *The Dictionary of the Apostolic Church* was published, the first volume in 1915 and the second in 1918.

Nor have I told the whole tale of his labours on behalf of the Christian teacher and preacher, that is, apart from his thirty-three years' editorship of this magazine. There were the series of homiletical books: *The Great Texts of the Bible, The Greater Men and Women of the Bible, The Great Christian Doctrines, The Children's Great Texts of the Bible,* and *The Speaker's Bible,* the first volume of which had just been issued at the time of his death—not to speak of 'The Scholar as Preacher' series. In itself a very remarkable output.

As I look back upon his editorial work as so far recorded, I am inclined to apply to Hastings the tribute he himself once paid to Sir Thomas Clark, Bt., founder of the great publishing house with which Hastings was all along associated: 'Scotland probably owes him more than can ever be acknowledged. For Scotland has passed through a great theological crisis with extraordinary ease and benefit, and the steady, evangelical, yet never intolerant hand that more than any other guided the theological reading of Scotland these trying years had not a little to do with it. And not Scotland only. England and America have claimed him as their own.'

And now I turn to Hastings' highest achievement, that noble monument of his editorial insight, courage, discernment, and genius, *The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.*

Already in 1908, after six years of close and intensive preparation, the first volume had appeared. With each succeeding year came a new volume, till the ninth had appeared. The last three volumes came in 1918, 1920, and 1921. The wonder is not that the rate of production diminished but that it was, despite the War, so well maintained. It is good to remember that Hastings lived to see this great enterprise brought to completion.

True, the magnificent Index Volume did not appear until 1926. But Hastings directed the work on it for nearly a year before his death. Its actual compilation was an exacting task, and was ably accomplished by Mary C. Laburn and D. R. Dow, who were on the editorial staff almost from the inception of the *Encyclopædia.*

I am tempted to enlarge once again [1] upon the usefulness of the Index Volume, as offering to the student of religion and ethics a gateway to 'the palace of learning.' Personally, I have used the Index Volume often as such. And I have also used it now and then for a much humbler purpose. Dr. Gossip has a style of handwriting all his own. It is enviably artistic in appearance, but it would be a godsend to examiners in the Civil Service test known as 'Copying MS.' When he sent his Papers to me on the Ethics of Buddhism for students taking the B.D. examination at Glasgow I could not have made a fair copy of them for the printer had I not first consulted the Index Volume for the exact spelling of certain Indian and other words.

What an original undertaking the *Encyclopædia* was! It aimed at producing articles on all the religions of the world and on all the great systems of ethics, on every religious belief or custom and on every ethical movement, every philosophical idea, every moral practice; and at including such persons and places as are famous in the history of religion and morals.

What a distinguished body of counsellors and assistants Hastings drew around him, and what a large and varied body of experts were among those to whom he sent his commissions! He could hardly have enlisted such help and co-operation but for the confidence in him that had been engendered through the resounding success of his *Dictionary of the Bible.* J. A. Selbie, his *fidus Achates* all through his adventures upon

[1] Cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, XXXVIII. viii. 355-358.

the strange and perilous paths of the dictionarian and encyclopædist, in reminding us of the sort of 'team' Hastings guided and handled from his 'seat in the editorial chariot,' Christians and Jews, Protestants and Roman Catholics, Muhammadans and Parsees, Russians and Japs, Frenchmen and Germans, has recorded that 'one day he would receive an article from a resident in an episcopal palace, another day one from a political convict in a Russian penal settlement.'

My own real acquaintance with Hastings began at the close of the First World War, when he invited me to undertake certain articles for his twelfth and last volume. I came then to know something of his editorial methods. At the outset he indicated what he looked for in an article—accuracy, comprehensiveness, orderliness, and good English style. I remember his telling me how very satisfied he was with W. Douglas Mackenzie's article on 'Jesus Christ' in the seventh volume. He was very emphatic on the point of good English style, which he required not only of his contributors but also of his translators. He was meticulous in the matter of quotations, not allowing the quoter to rob the author even of an introductory definite article! To secure what he looked for in the submitted manuscript or typescript he had no hesitation in wielding the 'blue pencil,' which—as he tells us in characteristic meiosis — sometimes elicited 'remarks' on the part of the contributor.

Naturally he had to insist on punctuality in the delivery of the article. There must have been many a telegram in the years when the *Encyclopædia* was being published comparable to one which once in Dr. Hastings' absence puzzled and perturbed the Manse household at St. Cyrus (it was not until 1911 that he retired from his ministerial charge and went to Aberdeen, his academic home): 'Isaac arriving in a few hours'—'Isaac' being an article which Herbert E. Ryle had promised for the *Dictionary of the Bible*.

I inquired one day of Hastings about a curious entry in the ninth volume of the *Encyclopædia*. He explained that the contributor was to write on 'Optimism,' or at any rate on 'Optimism and Pessimism,' but that because of certain circumstances the article could not be forwarded in time. I can imagine the rueful smile with which Hastings made the entry in the ninth volume, 'Optimism. —See Pessimism.'

I can imagine also the amused smile and gentle tolerance with which he received my late colleague's regrets that the concluding article of the *Encyclopædia* (that on 'Zwingli') would not end with the pious sentiment, 'A. Main.'

With the issue of the twelfth and last volume of the *Encyclopædia* a great chorus of praise rose from many quarters. The *Encyclopædia* was acclaimed as a work of incomparable merit and applauded for the largeness of its plan and the splendidly efficient execution of it. H. R. Mackintosh called attention later to the generous appreciation of it by Dr. Christlieb of Berlin in the columns of its most important German rival (*Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*). Writing after only four volumes of the *Encyclopædia* had been published, Christlieb felt ready to say: 'In it the Anglo-Saxons, who up till now have so much leaned on German theology, have emancipated themselves; not only so, they have surpassed us in wealth of material and the fulness of individual contribution.'

What of the *Encyclopædia's* future? Like the *Dictionaries*, it contains much of enduring value and will carry the great editor's name down the generations. Nor is the day likely to come soon when it will be superseded.

When the pen fell from Hastings' hand he had other editorial projects in view. Among them were a Dictionary of Missions and a Concordance to the Bible, and—it may well be—a Dictionary of the English Language of the Bible, a subject in which he was deeply interested and on which he had himself spent much time in scholarly research.

By way of conclusion I quote this estimate of Hastings from an eloquent and discerning memorial tribute by W. A. Curtis: 'By his individual courage and toil, by his penetrating insight into the deeper needs of the religious world for competent guidance in its use of its authoritative Scriptures, by his singular combination of the zeal of a visionary with the common sense and shrewd judgment of a business man, by his persistence in tracking down the men he needed for the myriad tasks which were essential to his herculean enterprise, and in persuading them to lay other work aside and assist him in completing it, it is not too much to say that he effected a revolution in the theological world, and gave to Scotland a new place and rank in the records of religious study and research.'

Notes of Recent Exposition

Dr. C. H. Dodd is of the two or three greatest living New Testament scholars, and everything he writes bears the master's marks. His latest book, *Gospel and Law* [1]—four Bampton Lectures given in America at Columbia University—is so replete with his own felicitous translations and characteristic insights that we propose to share some of its riches with our readers. The subject is New Testament ethics.

Apostolic Christianity had two sides to it: *kerygma* and *didaché*: the gospel which declared God's saving action in Christ and the moral instruction the apostles imparted to those who accepted the Good News. Now, by studying and comparing the 'practical' sections of the New Testament epistles, we make the discovery that this moral instruction, or *catechesis*, whether imparted by Paul or Peter or some other apostolic man, took a fairly uniform pattern, that it dealt in plain workaday rules for ordinary living, and that these rules owed quite a lot to the moral wisdom taught by the Stoics and Hellenistic Jews. (The 'household rules' are the most obvious example.)

The early Christian teachers, however, had something new, important, and distinctively Christian to add. So we find that their *catechesis* is shot through with specifically Christian motifs —motifs deriving from the gospel. One obvious motif is the imitation of Christ, the imitation not merely of the human example of Jesus but also of the Divine condescension in Christ which was the core of the gospel. (See, for example, Ph $2^{5ff.}$) Another was the conception of the Christian fellowship as the Body of Christ, *i.e.*, a social organism not self-determining but owing its life and nature to its Head, the risen and regnant Christ. This involved a complete change in the idea of social obligations. A third motif was the primacy of *agapé* or love. *Agapé* is not one virtue among many to which a man may aspire, but the total attitude and response of men who have been exposed to the love of God evidenced in the sacrifice of Christ. 'We love because He first loved us.'

To these motifs must be added another, the element supplied by the ethical teaching of Jesus. This teaching is quite different from the normal *catechesis* in which it is often embedded. It is different because it originated in a unique historical crisis—the coming of the Kingdom of God in Jesus Christ—a crisis which established a new order of things between God and man, and whose watchword is: 'The Reign of God has come. Repent, and believe the Gospel.' Seen in this light Jesus' ethical precepts, so far from being plain, practical rules, are the disclosure of the absolute standards of the Kingdom of God. Expressed as they are in pictures of action in concrete situations, they bring God's judgment home to us, make us repent, and prepare us to receive the Divine forgiveness.

Would it be proper to describe Jesus' moral teaching as a law? This is a delicate question to answer. Obviously His precepts are not straightforward practicable rules to be simply enforced. Obviously they have something of the nature of an absolute ethic. But just as obviously Jesus somehow means them to be obeyed. Or what is the point of the Parable of the Two Houses with which He ends the Sermon on the Mount?

Neo-Protestant theologians will bridle at the suggestion that Jesus' teaching is any kind of law. 'Christianity,' they will protest, 'is not a new law. We are not under law but under grace.' Yet the man who wrote the last sentence, St. Paul, did speak of 'the law of Christ.' In what sense then can the ethic of Christ be regarded as a new law?

Not in the sense of a code of regulations to be applied and enforced in every particular situation. That is legalism. Yet one might borrow Jeremiah's phrase and call Christ's ethic 'a law written *in the heart.*' This would not be the same thing as the doctrine of 'the inner light.' Nor would it mean that Christianity is 'a religion of the spirit' as contrasted with religions of authority. For the Kingdom of God, of which Christ's teaching is the moral ideal, implies a King, *i.e.* authority; and, what is more, Jesus spoke with authentic authority.

Let us go a little deeper into the matter. As the Old Covenant meant two things: (*a*) a Divine act, delivering Israel from Egypt, and (*b*) a Divine demand laid upon Israel thus delivered, so the New Covenant means two things: (*a*) the Divine act for man's redeeming in Christ (see Jn 3^{16}), and (*b*) a demand, growing out of it, that men should love each other as God had loved them in Christ. Thus we of the new Israel are under

[1] Cambridge University Press; 9s. net.

obligation to reproduce in our own living something of the quality of God's saving act in Christ. Nor will it be enough to sum up this obligation in Augustine's dangerous 'Love, and do as you please.' Something more definite is required.

Let us now return to Jesus' ethical precepts and see how they come in here. Clearly they are not laws like, for example, the Jewish law of tithe. You can keep this last law, as the punctilious Jew did, and yet be far from the Kingdom. Rather, the sayings of Jesus suggest the *quality* and *direction* of life as it should be lived in the Kingdom of God. They are spurs to action. As we try to live them, though we never completely fulfil them, they build up a certain outlook on the world, a bias of mind, a standard of moral judgment.

So, to sum up, the law of Christ is not a code of regulations but something very like what the Germans call a *Gesinnungs-ethik*—a moral law, which, as we try to fulfil it, helps to create in us the quality and direction of the life which God requires of us under the New Covenant.

Primarily this 'law of Christ' is meant for committed Christians; but that does not mean that it has nothing to say to men who live outside the circle of grace. If that were so, the God of Redemption could not be the God of Creation. Which would be at once great heresy, and in deep contradiction to the mind of Christ. No, in a deep sense, the 'law' of the New Covenant is also the law of Creation. (Remember how, on the question of divorce, Jesus went back to the Divine intention in Creation.) Therefore, though it is the Church's first duty to see that the law of Christ operates among its members, it has also to bear witness to the aboriginal law of Creation. And this it will do as it pronounces moral judgments on human conduct outside the limits of its own fellowship. Nay more, in a time like this when great anti-Christian systems dominate the earth and repudiate the law of creation, this the Church must do.

From all this it will be evident that Dr. DODD's latest book is no commonplace treatise on New Testament ethics.

In what sense, if any, ought the conception of sacrifice to enter into eucharistic worship? Both Luther and Calvin rejected it on the ground that the sacrifice at Calvary had been offered once for all, and neither could be nor need be repeated. To them and their spiritual descendants the idea of the 'Lord being slaughtered anew by the priests of the Mass' was a Roman abomination. The traditional view within the Reformed Churches and among the evangelicals of the Church of England is that only in an attenuated sense can the word sacrifice be used of eucharistic worship, namely to denote our offering of praise and thanksgiving in gratitude for the blessings received through the one sacrifice at Calvary. Accordingly there should be nothing in the words spoken or the acts performed which could be taken as suggestive of the further idea of an offering of Christ to the Father. So the matter as between Romanist and Protestant has remained for generations.

In our day, however, the situation seems to be changing, and this has become a live issue again. On the one hand, even Roman Catholic divines are to be found conceding that there is no repetition of Golgotha in the Mass. For the idea of repetition they would substitute re-presentation. On the other hand, some non-Roman theologians are now able to speak of a sacrifice of the Body of Christ in the Eucharist, and to find Biblical as well as patristic authority for so doing. The Epistle to the Hebrews, for instance, commonly interpreted in the Reformed tradition to imply that the sacrifice at the heavenly altar has abolished sacrifices on earth, may be taken as justifying the idea, traditional in Orthodox liturgical worship, that in the Eucharist the crucified, risen, and ascended Lord unites His worshippers with Himself in His eternal self-offering to the Father.

This conception of the eucharistic sacrifice seems to be gaining ground. It had a place in the Report of the Edinburgh Conference on Faith and Order in 1937, and it appears again in the Report of an International Theological Commission of Faith and Order, appointed shortly after the Edinburgh Conference, and as a continuation of it, to study ways of worship. The Report, published alone at 2s., is now published, along with a large selection of the papers contributed in the course of the Commission's studies, in a handsome volume—*Ways of Worship*,[1] edited by PEHR EDWALL, ERIC HAYMAN, and WILLIAM D. MAXWELL. The contributors are many and varied, reaching all the way from Roman Catholic and Orthodox to the Religious Society of Friends. The volume is a summary of present-day liturgical opinions, and its purpose is to provide material for discussion by the delegates of the Churches when they meet at Lund for the World Conference on Faith and Order.

Twenty-five years ago the late Dr. Anderson Scott could write: 'We of the Reformed Churches have a simple and conclusive answer to the

[1] S.C.M.; 21s. net.

principal argument whereby " Catholics " seek to justify " the sacrifice of the Mass," meaning thereby a sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ regarded objectively and apart from His people. They appeal with confidence to passages in early Christian literature in which the idea of sacrifice and sometimes of the sacrifice of the Body of Christ is closely connected with the Lord's Supper. But we have found the true explanation of all such references. There was a sacrifice, and it was a sacrifice of " the Body of Christ." But the " Body " was there, not because through the speaking of certain words by the proper person the Bread and the Wine had been changed into the Body and Blood, but because by the power of the Holy Spirit living men and women had been knit together into a living Body of Christ ; because by the same Spirit they had been " consecrated " in public worship ; and because they, conscious of themselves as the Body of Christ, had then made corporate offering and sacrifice of themselves to God.' In like manner the late Professor van der Leeuw, Chairman of the Theological Commission mentioned above, in a paper printed along with the Report, though lacking the author's revision, says : ' At the Lord's Table the sacrifice of Christ is re-presented and the faithful are called upon to partake in this sacrifice. They cannot receive it and make it their own without giving themselves, without offering up their lives. At the Table of the Lord they are not only receivers of the gifts of Christ, but they officiate, they partake, they exercise the priesthood conferred upon them by Baptism and Confirmation.'

The Commission, looking forward to the Lund Conference, remarks that ' some different practices which at first sight seem incompatible because implying incompatible doctrines may turn out to be less irreconcilable than appears. We may instance rites and ceremonies which express a sacrificial element in worship. . . . When some who worship in this way explain what they mean by sacrifice, the doctrinal implications of the practice appear to be other than has usually been assumed by those who object to the practice.' On the other hand the Commission is clear that there are some differences in ways of worship which undoubtedly reflect doctrinal positions that appear to be stubbornly incompatible, for example, Protestant objections to devotions connected with the Eucharist and with the Virgin and saints.

Literature

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

Did St. Paul write Ephesians ? Most of us in this country would like to think so ; but nowadays we are so immersed in Biblical theology that we have almost forgotten that the question existed or that forty years ago Dr. Moffatt said quite firmly that Paul did not write the letter. Across the Atlantic, we gather, things are rather different. In critical circles there the fashion is to accept Dr. Goodspeed's guidance on the matter. And Goodspeed not only denies the Pauline authorship, but produces an original theory of his own about Ephesians.

But if we in Britain thought we could permanently burke the question, we were mistaken. There has just appeared a massive treatise on *The Epistle to the Ephesians* (Clarendon Press ; 30s. net), by the Rev. C. Leslie Mitton, M.Th., Ph.D., a Methodist minister already known to some of our readers. Unless my judgment is wrong, we will have to take his arguments very seriously. Having done that, we may still not accept his conclusions, but we shall have to admit that no British book in this century has handled the problem of Ephesians with such competence.

What Dr. Mitton gives us is a revised and improved version of Goodspeed's theory, that Ephesians is the work of a sub-Paulinist in the Ephesus area who, knowing Colossians by heart, and loving St. Paul, set himself, about A.D. 90, to produce a summary of the Apostle's thought which would serve as an introduction to Paul's collected letters. But Dr. Mitton, being more cautious and less fanciful than Goodspeed, is therefore a foeman more worthy of the best conservative steel.

The book has four parts. Part I describes the controversy and outlines Goodspeed's theory. Part II discusses the relationship between Ephesians and Colossians. Part III handles the relationship between Ephesians and the other Pauline Epistles. Part IV treats of the date of Ephesians and summarizes Dr. Mitton's findings. A final chapter sets out the advantages of giving up the Pauline authorship ; and six appendices round off this very thorough book.

The case against Pauline authorship may be called fourfold : linguistic, stylistic, doctrinal, and literary. The conservative critic need not fear objections one and three ; for, after all, the proportion of new words in Ephesians is not unduly

high, and the alleged advances in doctrine do not go much beyond the mind of Paul as we know it from the commonly accepted letters. The difference in style remains, but is not (I think) decisive. What Dr. Mitton regards as decisive is the literary difficulty. In other words, his main case against Paul's authorship is based on two things.

(1) His study of the relationship between Ephesians and Colossians, where the use in Ephesians of words in Colossians but with different meanings and the phenomenon of 'conflation' suggest the imitator's hand.

(2) His study of the relationship between Ephesians and the other letters of Paul. Here he finds that the parallels between Ephesians and the other Paulines are double those between the genuine Philippians and the others; that these parallels are not haphazard but sustained and recurring; and that Ephesians has a suspicious way of quoting memorable dicta of St. Paul not found in the universally accepted Philippians.

This bare sketch of Dr. Mitton's argument does no sort of justice to the delicacy of his tests for distinguishing between a genuine and a non-genuine Pauline letter. But it is here, in this matter of relationships, that the strength, or weakness, of his case lies. Not all will agree about the phrase-conflations (from Colossians) in Ephesians. Many will still think the simpler explanation of the close links between Colossians and Ephesians to be the better one, namely, that they go back to Paul who wrote Ephesians soon after Colossians, and used many of the same phrases. For myself, I shall need some persuading that the alleged word-differences in Ephesians are remarkable enough to make a cogent argument against Pauline authorship; nor do I think that when Dr. Mitton compares Ephesians with First Peter he is fair to the hypothesis of moral codes. I cannot agree that a phrase like 'less than the least of all the saints' betrays the hand of the imitator; and I should have thought that a man who aimed to produce a letter which Dr. Mitton describes as 'the Gospel according to St. Paul' would have remembered that Paul had a strong belief in the Second Advent. Yet before I should feel happy about rejecting Dr. Mitton's whole case, I should like the chance to work through his whole careful argument point by point. (Ernst Percy of Lund who recently investigated the whole problem concluded that Ephesians was probably Paul's work.) Nevertheless, two things are quite certain. First, we who hold to the Pauline authorship must frankly face up to Dr. Mitton's total argument. Second, he has produced a book which for grasp of the subject, exact scholarship and scrupulous fairness, is one of the finest samples of British New Testament science in recent years. How on earth did a man on circuit contrive to do it?

A. M. HUNTER

BAPTISM AND CONFIRMATION

The Seal of the Spirit (Longmans; 35s. net), by the Rev. G. W. H. Lampe, M.C., M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, is an able and scholarly study of the doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers with a view to elucidating among other things the relationship between those two rites or ordinances. It appears to have been prompted by the recent claims of Dom Gregory Dix and Fr. L. S. Thornton, to name no others, that the main weight of theological emphasis is properly laid not on Baptism but on Confirmation; in this, carrying out a line of thought expounded sixty years ago by Dr. A. J. Mason. The argument in great part turns round the question of the meaning of the New Testament conception of 'the seal of the Spirit'; hence the title of this work.

The work is divided into four parts: The Seal of the Spirit in the New Testament; The Sealing of the Faithful in the Early Church; The Sacramental Reception of the Holy Spirit; Patristic Theories of Sealing. The documentation is very careful, the bibliography (chiefly of English and German writings) extensive, and the indexes most serviceable; while the style in exposition is clear, logical, and distinguished.

One is apt to think that such a study in early Baptismal doctrine as is here offered is of no great concern to modern Christian theologians. But it is rightly claimed for it that it has a close bearing upon questions of urgent topical importance. In particular, it seeks to counter a doctrinal position for which the solid weight of patristic teaching is claimed by some writers and which, if accepted by Anglicans generally, would strongly tend to frustrate present hopes of Christian reunion among the non-Roman churches. If, as Thornton and others contend, the indwelling of the Spirit takes place only after the rite of Confirmation, then it would appear to follow that no person unconfirmed by a bishop can be possessed of the Spirit. Hardly a common platform for conferences on reunion!

But on this point I should like to quote Mr. Lampe himself, prefacing that I cannot enter into the learned discussion in which he engages, but that I hope he has undermined this novel and strange doctrinal position: 'It would require the plainest and most direct authority of Scripture, recognised and upheld by constant and uniform testimony of the Church's tradition, to compel

us to accept a doctrine apparently so much at variance, not only with the facts of experience, but also with the essential character of the Gospel. . . . The consequences of its acceptance, should we be persuaded of its truth, would be grave in the extreme. Christian Baptism would be reduced to the level of the baptism of John, a preparatory cleansing in expectation of a future baptism with the Holy Spirit; Confirmation would become, not merely a sacrament in the fullest sense (which the Anglican Articles deny), but the great sacrament without whose reception no man could call himself a Christian; the New Covenant would be set on a par with the Old Covenant of the Law in so far as it too would have its outward sign and seal without which no one could be reckoned among the number of God's people, even though he had been baptized; and at a stroke the whole basis of the œcumenical movement for the unity of Christendom would be shattered.'

In result of his research Mr. Lampe reaches the specific conclusions: (1) that there is no foundation in the New Testament, nor any clear testimony in the early Fathers, for the view that in the Christian dispensation God's people are sealed as His own possession by undergoing an outward and visible ceremony other than Baptism in water. (2) There is little convincing evidence in the New Testament for the view that Baptism regularly involved or included any other rite than the Baptism in water which was practised from the earliest days of the Church. (3) Baptism was at a relatively early date embellished with various other symbolical actions, such as chrismation and the laying on of hands. W. FULTON

THE HEBREW TEXT OF JOB

Critical Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Poem of Job, by Emeritus Professor W. B. Stevenson, D.Litt., D.D., LL.D. (Aberdeen University Press; 16s. net.), is a supplement, and a very necessary supplement, to the author's Schweich Lectures on 'The Poem of Job' [1947]. The latter contained a very forceful translation of the poem, based upon a critically reconstructed text; and although it included an Appendix, 'Notes on the New Translation,' the Notes were not sufficient to enable the reader of the Hebrew to check the translation in detail. As a Preliminary Note to the present volume Dr. Stevenson explains the textual critical principles on which he has worked. To some of his readers these may seem advanced, in view of the present more conservative attitude to the Massoretic Text. He does not hesitate to employ literary criteria and rhythmic tests as instruments of criticism. It might seem dangerous to employ literary criteria; at the same time it is very generally recognized that there are serious dislocations in the third cycle of speeches (chs. 25–27). There are therefore no antecedent reasons why minor dislocations should not have taken place elsewhere. As to emendations *metri causa*, these are now generally frowned upon. Dr. Stevenson is content to say of them that 'the gain accruing from these corrections is more often literary than material or logical.' On the whole subject of emendation he is cautious enough to say: 'But corrections of unintelligible sentences are never quite convincing unless the proposed substitutes are supported by the ancient versions or are based on a knowledge of the mistakes to which copyists were liable.'

Expertness in Old Testament textual criticism cannot be obtained from any text-book on the subject. The student must 'play himself in' gradually, studying his Hebrew Bible for years, indeed for life. If there are any short cuts to mastery they are to be found in a volume like the present, in which a seasoned scholar deals with a continuous piece of text, and examines it in the light of the versions and the generally accepted criteria of what is a very complicated science.

C. R. NORTH

CHRISTIANS IN INDIA

Problems in India are very similar to those nearer home, and one most frequently debated is the duty of the Christian in respect of political and social movements. Dr. A. J. Appasamy, a Bishop of the South Indian Church, has no doubt whatsoever as to the attitude the Christian community should take up towards the public life of Independent India. In *The Christian Task in Independent India* (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net) he complains that in the past the Christian Church in India, with some notable exceptions, has been too aloof, and has during the British regime accepted too easily the Governmental ban on political action. Now participation is urgent, and the door of effective opportunity is wide open. The Christian must on no account seek collective or individual privilege, but be willing to stand on his own feet. On the whole, Dr. Appasamy's judgments are fair, both as regards the past and the present. On one point, however, he seems less than fair, as when he blames the British Government for the neglect of elementary education, and gives as the reason that it would have been more difficult to rule a people amongst whom education was widespread. Otherwise he is ready to admit that present opportunities have been in many cases provided as a result of past British policy. He pays glowing tribute to the fair-mindedness of the Hindu

majority, and his opinion would seem to be justified by the number of important positions occupied by Christians. Dr. Appasamy pleads for co-operation between Christians and non-Christians in every walk of life. He has less than no use for watertight Christian institutions, and strengthens his argument by arresting biographies of Christians who have risen to positions of great influence after education in Colleges in which no such policy of segregation was followed. The book shows great width of outlook in its choice of topics, and one of the most valuable chapters is devoted to the Christians' relation to the ancient culture and philosophy of India.

W. S. URQUHART

An Introduction to the Study of Ecclesiastical Latin, by the Rev. H. V. P. Nunn, M.A. (Alden and Blackwell; 7s. 6d. net), is the third edition of a book first published in 1922. It is well laid out and in every way competently done. Its value is greatly increased by a series of selections from ecclesiastical writers and by an appendix of Latin Hymns. It is absolutely indispensable for students in this field, and its price, in those days, borders on the miraculous.

The Educational Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, Mr. John Drewett, writes a useful short study of the Biblical doctrine of 'The Remnant' under the title *Not Many Mighty* (Church Book Room; 3s. net). He quotes Dr. T. W. Manson's emphasis on the fact that it is as a saving, not a saved, remnant that a living Church must function.

This doctrine of 'The Remnant' may appear all too increasingly relevant to the Church in our day. Still there seems a danger of encouraging pessimism and complacency in his argument that 'the normal pattern of the Christian community is to consist of small minorities.'

The late Rev. Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas was a well-known preacher and theologian of the Anglican Church. His Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles and his Manual of Church Doctrine are being reprinted, and there was published in America in 1950 for the first time his posthumous *Outline Studies in the Gospel of St. Luke*. This book has now appeared in a British edition (Church Book Room; 14s. net). The Editor is the author's daughter, who explains that the book is not a commentary in the exact sense; the notes do not treat of every passage in the Third Gospel, and sometimes there is more than one note on a passage. The outlines were meant to be expanded by the author as occasion arose, into sermons, addresses, or articles. In such a form the material here presented should prove very helpful and suggestive to busy preachers and teachers. Their use of these outlines, which are often in much detail, need not be more than selective. They will appreciate the author's habit of offering a 'practical application' at the close of the study of a Gospel passage. We wish success to this pious venture.

Truth Unchanged, Unchanging (James Clarke; 6s. net), by the Rev. D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, Minister of Westminster Chapel, London, consists of a set of five Lectures delivered under the Jonathan Blanchard Foundation at Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois, in 1947. The author was the first lecturer appointed by the founders, and he was desired to make his lectures of a general apologetic character. He has done well to concentrate on the topical subject of the doctrine of man. His argument is well and closely sustained, and presented in a clear, popular style. He discusses the modern cult of self-expression, the shallow optimism of the day, and the futility of sincerity and zeal when undirected by knowledge. All this against the background of Christian belief. Then he turns to the direct exposition of Christian belief in his chapters on the simplicity of the gospel and its relevance to our time. As one might anticipate, the book is faithful to the evangelical tradition.

The third of the Spiritual Healing Booklets published by the Epworth Press is *The Way of Integration*, by Professor H. A. Hodges. The price is 1s. 6d. net. It is a reprint of the author's lecture at the Third Conference of the Methodist Society for Medical and Pastoral Psychology in 1948. As might be expected from one who is both a distinguished philosopher and a devout Christian, there are rich insights here on theology and philosophy as well as psychology. The significance of the title lies in the fact that man is not born integrated. The co-ordination of his various capacities must wait on experience and education throughout the whole of life. Towards the end of the booklet Professor Hodges sets out in untechnical language the essentials of the Catholic map of increasing integration—the purgative way, the illuminative way, and the unitive way—and suggests an interesting correlation of it with the Methodist map. Conversion in Methodist terminology corresponds to the transition from the purgative to the illuminative way. John Wesley's period of effort, beginning with the founding of

the Holy Club and ending with his experience at the Aldersgate Street meeting, was his purgative way. 'If conversion is something which Wesley saw and the Catholic overlooks, the dark night seems perhaps to be something which the Catholic knows and which Wesley neglected.' This is an excellent piece of work, clearly written and illuminating more than the main topic.

Instruction on the Religious Life, third series, by Father Richard Meux Benson (Mowbray; 10s. 6d. net), consists of twelve lectures which were originally given as retreat addresses in 1874 to the Society of St. John the Evangelist, of which Father Benson was the Father Founder. This is a strange book. It has all sorts of mannerisms which might repel the modern reader. It uses allegory of the worst kind. 'The Magdalen is the type of the elect people of God. Her name expresses the number of the elect, for it is 100, and 50, and 3. That is the sum of her name, and that is the number of the elect as set forth in that miraculous draught of fishes after the Resurrection.' It is diffuse and repetitive. It uses the older and exclamatory style of address. And yet when all is said and done there is something apostolic about this book. To have attended these lectures when they were first given must have been a spiritual experience of the first magnitude. The book is full of stabbing thoughts. 'It is a great token of humility to receive kindnesses at all people's hands. . . . Humility preserves from any sense of humiliation.' 'Patience consists of going on with the same routine of life undisturbed.' 'We ought to have a capacity of immediately settling down, if it is only for a short time when we are waiting at a railway station.' 'How often it is the case that when past sins are laid aside there is a certain pleasure in remembering them.' 'Prayer . . . carries all this world in order to bathe it in the glory of God.' 'The true purpose of the intercourse of this life is just to become acquainted with one another's needs.' There are twelve chapters in this book on Faith, Poverty, Chastity, Obedience, Humility, Patience, Submission, Readiness, Purity of Affection, Intercession, Silence, and Charity. No one will read it without feeling that he has been in touch with one who knew both the Spirit of God and the heart of man.

A Church Renascent, by Mr. David Watmough (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net), is a Study in Modern French Catholicism by an Anglican for Anglicans. The author writes with the authority of one who has had close contacts with the churchmen of the renaissance in the French Church, and has a wide acquaintance with their literature, as is shown by his bibliography in French and English. He deals with that Church's new approach to the proletariat, which is distinct from Jocism as well as from Christian Socialism: he deals also with its approach to the rural communities and to special groups, such as professional artists connected with the theatre, cinema, and radio. An interesting chapter shows how the new spirit expressed in these spheres also appears in the eirenic movement associated with the name of the Abbé Paul Couturier. Liturgical and Biblical revivals are also involved, and the author is of opinion that the one word which would express the link between these various aspects of the renaissance and at the same time touch the very kernel of them all would be prayerfulness.

There is much of interest and stimulus here for others than Anglicans, indeed for all who are concerned that the Church of Christ should be not a high and dry institution, but an organism adaptable to its mission among modern semi-pagans of every class.

An Experiment in Worship, by Mr. Ian Thomson (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net), describes the Revival of the Agape in Holy Week 1949 in the parish of Hilgay in the diocese of Ely. Since the Anglicans and the Methodists could not come together at the Lord's Table they decided to come together at the Agape. The one test for those who would come was that they should have been baptized and that they should 'love the Lord in sincerity and truth.' It is laid down that the essentials of the Agape are simply 'a breaking of bread and a sharing of the broken bread with prayer.' The order of service in the Anglican Church was Hymn, Sentences, Psalm 145, Lesson: St. John 17, Hymn, Sermon, Hymn, Nicene Creed, Agape: (i) Prayers, (ii) Blessing and breaking of bread, (iii) The Lord's Prayer, (iv) Distribution, Prayers, Hymn, Blessing. When the Agape was held in the Methodist Church the only essential difference was the addition of Testimony after the Agape. There are two things to be said. First, this does indeed seem to provide a place where the different communions can come together without violating their own so-called principles. But second, nothing could be more unlike the Agape of New Testament times. For then the Agape, if it was anything, was a real meal and not a symbolic meal, and it was in that fellowship of really eating together that the whole value lay. There is a useful bibliography on the subject of the Agape. To it there should certainly be added 'Eucharistic Origins' by Dr. G. H. C. Macgregor.

Concerning the New Translation of the Bible

By the Reverend John K. S. Reid, B.D., Edinburgh

Most of the Churches of this country have committed themselves to the preparation of a New Translation of the Bible. That is to say, duly appointed representatives of the churches have met and are meeting together in conference over a new translation now being made by Biblical and linguistic scholars of the highest rank who are rendering the original texts into English, with the co-operation of the University Presses of Oxford and Cambridge who are financing the project. Publicity has already been accorded to this venture, and it will not be news to the readers of this magazine. They may, however, be glad to have something more said about the matter than can well be intimated in brief press notices.

It all began within the Church of Scotland, when at the General Assembly in May 1946 an overture was presented by the Presbytery of Stirling and Dunblane 'anent the translation of the Bible into the language of the present day.' The General Assembly approved the overture and remitted the matter to a special committee. This committee met within a month of the close of the Assembly, and from its very first meeting there emanated the lines along which the whole project has since moved with surprising fidelity and little alteration or correction. For one thing, it at once prepared an approach to 'the four principal or representative Communions, the Church of England, the Methodist Church of Great Britain, the Congregational Union, and the Baptist Union,' asking whether their co-operation might be expected if a new translation were to be undertaken. Along with this letter of inquiry, a memorandum was submitted, indicating both the nature and the urgency of the need for a new translation, and certain 'main principles on which it is desirable that the new translation should be based' were set forth.

Within a few weeks affirmative replies were received to the invitation, and as early as October of the same year delegates appointed by the churches concerned met in London. These delegates 'unanimously agreed,' in the words of the Report presented to the General Assembly of 1947, 'to commend the proposal to the authorities of their respective churches, and ask them to co-operate in carrying it out.' The General Assembly approved the action taken by their delegates, and similar approval was a little earlier or a little later given by the appropriate bodies of the other churches hitherto concerned. The enterprise, with surprising ease and celerity, was under way.

In subsequent meetings of the appointed delegates, now gathered under the name of the Joint Committee on New Translation of the Bible, it was found necessary to enlarge and supplement the project as hitherto devised. Office-bearers were elected, the late Bishop of Truro becoming Chairman, and the Rev. (later Professor and Dr., and now of Princeton) G. S. Hendry, Secretary. The Presbyterian Church of England, the Society of Friends, the churches in Wales and the churches in Ireland were in turn issued with invitations which were accepted. Representation on the Committee was offered to and accepted by the British and Foreign Bible Society and the National Bible Society of Scotland. The number of representatives to be sent by the co-operating churches was adjusted and fixed. Agreement was reached with the Oxford and Cambridge University Presses on the terms under which they would undertake the publication and have vested in them the copyright of the new translation. Simultaneously arrangements were being made for the invitation and appointment of members to the Panels on Old Testament, New Testament, and Apocrypha, and of translators. Further reference to these will be made in a moment. Minutes of later meetings are full of references to matters submitted for definition and decision by the Panels to the Committee, or sent down by the Committee for consideration by the Panels. Timely provision was made for the regular preservation in some form of the findings thrown up by the scholarly and technical labour expended on the work. Principles have been evolved for the general guidance of those concerned in it. Now, shortly before this was written, there have appeared before the Committee the first passages in the draft translation that has been shaped by the work of the translators and Panels concerned.

Is the Project worth while? The reactions of people when they hear that a new translation is being prepared are liable to be various. Indeed, they have in fact manifested themselves very variously. It is improbable that I should have in any other way had brought to my notice certain

MSS. and comments or even commentaries concerned with some of the Biblical books, especially the Books of the Revelation, Daniel, and Genesis. I have a file for copies of replies made when returning these unsolicited contributions, in which such phrases as the following occur with some frequency: 'I cannot say that any MS. quite like yours was ever submitted to the translator'; 'your notes are conceived in rather a different form than the translation is likely to have when it appears'; 'it will not be possible to make extensive use of the suggestions you make, but perhaps they will find a use elsewhere.' I treasure in this file also a letter which begins: 'Dear Sir,—I hear you are engaged upon a new translation of the Bible. Let me give you my views about Hell'!

The case for a new translation could hardly have been better or more briefly formulated than when, at the very inception of the scheme, the Church of Scotland Committee drew up the memorandum which it submitted to the churches who were without exception to offer co-operation. It may well supply the few sentences which can be devoted to this aspect of the subject. Referring to the Church of Scotland statement on Evangelism, the memorandum quotes that 'the terminology which the evangelist naturally employs has almost no meaning for those whom he wishes to address. He seems to them to be speaking in a foreign language and using words which convey nothing to their minds.' It continues: 'We are fully appreciative of the superb literary qualities of the Authorized Version, its majestic style, its noble cadences, and the many excellences which have given it its unique place in our literature and endeared it to generations of Christians in the English-speaking world. But we are compelled to recognize that the A.V. is becoming unable to fulfil the function it was created to serve, because the language in which it is written is not the language our people speak or readily understand to-day. There is a wide gulf between the language of the seventeenth century and the language of the present day, and the passage of time is steadily widening it. . . . There is the further danger that, where the language of the Bible is intelligible with or without explanation, the archaic flavour may well give the impression that the message of the Bible itself belongs to a bygone age and has no relevance to the world of the twentieth century. This is especially to be deplored, since the New Testament was originally written in the "common" language of the time, and, as the papyri have shown, there are few of its terms which did not belong to the current vocabulary of everyday speech.' As already stated, the case for the undertaking in these or other terms was so forcibly felt that approval was unanimously and expeditiously secured. It may be said that public interest manifested since has confirmed this early impression.

Those who feel satisfied that there is need for modern translations alongside the A.V. may press another query: whether the production of yet another is not simply to duplicate work already done. The Joint Committee was of course aware of these other translations, made early reference to them, and felt on the whole that their existence encouraged rather than discouraged the attempt at one more. It faced and early turned away from the proposal that the project be limited to an offer of help from this country to the promoters of the American Standard Version of the Scriptures. It felt challenged by the new translation from the Vulgate of the New Testament produced and of the Old Testament authorized by the Roman Catholic hierarchy of England and Wales. Few people could anywhere be found to commend the R.V. with any enthusiasm for the needs of the modern generation. Moffatt, Weymouth, Goodspeed, and others represented private ventures, however notable, and neither have received nor could receive the official approval of the churches. 'The translation of the Bible is a responsibility of the Church; and it is only a version, carried out at the behest of the Church by men in whom it has confidence, that could be commended for general use and hope to gain popular acceptance. This appears to have been recognized in 1611. As the A.V. completed and crowned the labours of Tyndale, Coverdale, and the rest, so, we submit, the time has come for the Church to make history repeat itself, by producing a new authorized version which would complete and crown the labours of the various scholars who have prepared the way in this century.'

Principles and Methods. It was not only the bare proposal of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland that evoked ready approval from the churches approached, but also in large measure the general principles laid down. At the first conference, delegates found themselves appreciating the same need and suggesting identical principles for the production of something to satisfy it. The following principles were from the start approved. The work is to be a new translation and not a revision of any existing version, having as its object to render the original into contemporary English, avoiding all archaic words and forms of expression. It will have regard to native idiom and current usage of the English language; it will avoid Hebraisms and Graecisms which have not become anglicized; and freedom will be exercised in altering the construction of the original for the sake of intelligibility in English. The basis is to be the best ascertainable text (in the judgment of competent authorities). The

translation will be printed in paragraph form, with the poetical books and passages in verse form, and the modern system of punctuation, including quotation marks, throughout.

A supplementary memorandum was later adopted, after experience in translation had at various levels been gained. It is clearly before the mind of the Committee that, for those already familiar with the language of the A.V. and the Book of Common Prayer, a conservative revision, correcting the worst mistranslations, would suffice ; but it is not they primarily that compose the public which the new translation will have in view. It will rather bear in mind the large section of our people which has no effective contact with the Church in any of its communions, and for whom the A.V. has no associations. Many people of this kind are interested in the Bible and intelligent and educated enough to understand the Bible if put before them in a language that is acceptable. But the language in which the A.V. is couched is unfamiliar, frequently unintelligible, and where not actually unintelligible has an air of unreality. Further, there are the younger people for whom, if it is to make any impact, the Bible must be made ' contemporary,' and a new translation must at least be laid beside the A.V. as a key to its meaning. Besides these classes, there is also to be held in view the considerable number of intelligent people who attend church, and for whom the traditional language is so familiar that its phrases, as one of the Committee has put it, ' slide over their minds without stirring a ripple.'

The aim, then, with this kind of public in view, will be to render the Bible intelligible to contemporary readers, through the medium of (so far as practicable) a ' timeless English,' which will avoid equally both archaisms and transient modernisms. The intention is that it convey a sense of reality rather than ' hallowed associations,' have accuracy without pedantry, and possess sufficient dignity to be read aloud.

The aim is high and ambitious but not unattainable. In putting it into practice, a system has been built up which is complex but effective. An early suggestion on the part of the Committee supposed that the translation of the New Testament might be entrusted to one person with revision help by one or two others. In 1947 the Committee records the need for setting three scholars to work on the Old Testament and two on the New Testament. A year later, however, the Committee is found resolving that eight scholars be engaged on the translation of the Old Testament and three on that of the New Testament. In this way, one may say, the Committee has allowed the exigencies and scope of the work as they became apparent to make their own impression and to state their own demands, and has devised the means and measures whereby they could be met and satisfied.

A similar flexibility and even improvization characterizes the evolution of the procedure to which the work of a translator is subjected. At one end of the process, there is the translator himself. The Committee believed that for help in a project of this importance it might be able to draw upon the entire resources of Biblical scholarship which the country possesses. The promised co-operation of so many churches removed any denominational hindrances which might have limited the free employment of the skill and talent otherwise available. The Committee found its expectation in no way disappointed, and it may safely be said that the actual work of translation is in the hands of the most competent persons this country can provide.

At the other end of the process, it was from the very start recognized, the most careful oversight must be exercised over the literary propriety of what was produced. The initial documents suggest that ' the advice of one or more literary men be sought regarding the quality of the translation.' This rubric in practice was crystallized into the formation of a Literary Panel or Panel of Literary Experts, through whose hands draft translation in its last stages of preparation is required to pass. At this stage, if necessary, there is imparted to the work a quality which the translator alone cannot necessarily be expected to give.

Between these two initial and final points there operates a system of Panels. This is seen in its simpler form in the case of the New Testament. Here the work of the individual translator is carefully checked by reference to and consideration by a number of other persons qualified in the field, some of whom are engaged on the translation of other parts of the New Testament. The amended translation has then to be agreed to by the translator before it goes before the Literary Panel. In the case of the Old Testament, however, it was realized that length and textual diversity gave rise to peculiar difficulties, and it early became apparent that even more careful check and countercheck would have to be carried out. Sub-panels were set up to deal respectively with the historical, poetical, and prophetical books, and a good deal of time and labour was saved by passing draft translations through these comparatively independent and self-contained groups in initial stages. Further it was found necessary at the appropriate point to have available the advice of expert philologists. Thus the work of the individual translator passes through the hands of a good many people in the course of its preparation.

Members of the sub-panel dealing with the type of Old Testament book, members of the full Panel on the Old Testament, philological experts all examine it; and there is constant reference back to the translator himself. Only at the end of this process does the prepared document appear before the Literary Panel for scrutiny from another special angle.

Operation of the System. All this may seem, and indeed manifestly is, rather complex. I believe the Committee would be quite ready to admit this, and to justify it on the ground that it seems worth while to spend time in the preparation, if by so doing a lasting quality can be imparted to the final translation. Complexity is not necessarily disadvantageous: we are told that the human brain is incredibly complex, yet in some cases it works very well indeed. The complexity of structure for the preparation of this new translation will rightly be judged by the quality of the result. More serious is the misgiving that in the process of being handled by so many people, and especially by so many people in committee, all vestiges of character might be likely to be obliterated. Some members of the Committee were aware themselves of this misgiving and keenly alert to see what foundation it has. They have been reassured. Some collaboration is of course manifestly necessary, so that a currency of terms can be devised and employed commonly throughout the work. It would certainly have been a misfortune if this had resulted in the kind of pale bloodless decoction so often the final achievement of a Committee's work. As the work proceeded, however, two things have become clear. One is that co-operative work among the scholars engaged has in part discovered, and in part created, a notable consensus of opinion on many points—textual, hermeneutic, and others—where serious diversity might have been expected. A common mind has been slowly forming concerning how the original should be rendered. The discrepancies to be bridged and the incompatibilities ironed out by means of the heavy hand of Committee majority and so on, have, therefore, been fewer and less important than one might have feared. The other thing is attested by the members of the Literary Panel with much satisfaction. It is that in their view, in the case of the material that has come before them, there has been successfully conveyed and expressed, not only the meaning of the message, but even the authentic tones in which the original writer uttered it. If this early judgment of some of those engaged in the work is later endorsed by the public to which it is eventually given, it will be a very great achievement.

Some will be interested to learn the principles adopted concerning the text to be followed. As basis, the Old Testament translation will have the Hebrew text of Kittel's *editio tertia.* Where, however, one or more of the ancient versions indicate a text different from the Massoretic Text, a rendering of the underlying Hebrew may be admitted into the text of the translation. Each case is considered on its merits, and variations from the Massoretic Text will be carefully recorded. Conjectural emendations will be used as a *pis aller,* and only where the Panel responsible judges unanimously that neither Massoretic Text nor ancient versions yield intelligible meaning. The case of the New Testament presents its own problems, and the text translated will of necessity be eclectic, since no existing text can be taken as sole basis. Translators are instructed to take a standard text, for example, Hort, Souter, or Nestle, to depart from it where they feel compelled, to note such departures, and to be ready to vindicate their judgment if challenged by another member of the Panel. Ancient versions are taken into account equally with Greek MSS.; but a rigour similar to that exercised in the case of the Old Testament is demanded before any conjecture be admitted.

The Present Position, and the Prospects. The appearance of this article has been delayed until it could be said that the churches' representatives on the Joint Committee have had before them the first draft translations to have survived the long and careful process of preparation. One complete book from the Old Testament was before them, and half another prophetical book. Of the New Testament they had as samples a Gospel and an Epistle. Considered judgment must await the scrutiny of more material. It would not, however, be out of place to record the good impression that the samples made upon the Committee, the Committee's favourable judgment that the principles laid down for the translation have been followed, and the present writer's opinion that a translation is being made which is outstanding for general simplicity, smoothness, and grace, and for at least occasional force and pungency. From this time on, a steady stream of draft translations, passed through all stages of preparation, will come before the Committee.

It would be foolhardy to indulge in prophecies about the future of a work still at so rudimentary a stage. A number, and perhaps a considerable number, of years must elapse before it is given to the public. Meanwhile, it is to be remembered that the translation is not intended in the first place for reading in church, though the words, 'which would be recognized by the churches as an alternative version,' do occur in the memorandum of the first meeting of the initial conference. From

the very start, however, 'the religious instruction of the young' has been a prime motive, and it may be conjectured that the wide-scale public employment of the new translation will begin at this point. Starting at this level, there is no limit to the extent of use and employment which may be given to it, if the labour of those engaged upon making it is in God's providence crowned by the approval of the public for whom it is designed. 'It was,' states the initial invitation from the General Assembly to the churches, 'a vital concern of our pious forefathers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that the Bible should be made available to the people in the vulgar tongue. The A.V. nobly fulfilled that purpose for its own and many succeeding generations. But now, through no fault of its own, it is no longer able to fulfil it; and the time has come for the Church to undertake the preparation of a new version in a language understanded of the people of the present age, so that every man may hear in his own tongue (not that of his distant ancestors) the wonderful works of God.'

The Joint Committee hope that their work may thus be used, both for the profit of the people and *ad maiorem Dei gloriam.*

The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount

By Professor A. M. Hunter, Ph.D., D.Phil., D.D., University of Aberdeen

There are few forms of literature more ephemeral than sermons. Of one sermon only can it truly be said:

> Age cannot wither it, nor custom stale its infinite variety.

After nineteen centuries the Sermon on the Mount still haunts men. They may praise it, as Mahatma Gandhi did; or, like Nietzsche, they may curse it. They cannot ignore it. Its words are still powerful to rebuke and to inspire. Like some mighty magnetic mountain, it continues to attract to itself the greatest spirits of our race, so that, if a vote were taken, there is little doubt men would account it the most searching utterance ever made on the moral life.

Yet if men admire it, they do not agree about it. Some think it all 'plain sailing'; others think it impossible. Some judge it to be the heart of Christ's message to men; and others call it 'a sentence of doom' or 'the greatest indictment of sin in human history.' Some talk as if its precepts were meant for all men; others describe it as 'an ordination charge for the Twelve.' What is the truth about the Sermon? And what is its relevance for us to-day who live in other times, under other skies, and are vexed by other problems? Let us take a glance at some answers to these questions which have been given in this twentieth century.

I

Let us start with the question, What is the relation of the Sermon on the Mount to the gospel?

The late Mr. Gandhi once said: 'The message of Jesus is contained in the Sermon on the Mount, unadulterated and taken as a whole.'[1] Many people in our day have been of the same opinion. It is one of the popular heresies of our times—a heresy much propagated by the popular press when it writes on religious topics—that the Sermon is the sum of the gospel, all else being the mystification of the professional theologian.

No reputable New Testament scholar any longer believes this; but the heresy lives on in many minds and needs to be refuted. One way of doing this is to ask, What did the earliest Christians mean by the gospel? It was certainly not the Sermon. 'To the Apostles,' said Sir William Robertson Nicoll, 'the insistence on the Sermon on the Mount as the sum of Christianity would have appeared a relapse into a hopeless paganism.' This, however trenchantly stated, is a true judgment. When St. Paul reminded the Corinthian Christians of the fundamentals of the gospel he did not summarize them thus: 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, etc. Ye are the salt of the earth. Resist not evil. Love your enemies. Be not anxious for the morrow. Do to others as you would have them do to you.'

What he wrote was: 'I delivered unto you, as fundamental, what I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that He was buried; and that He hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures; and that He appeared to Cephas; then to the Twelve. . . .' (1 Co $15^{3ff.}$)

In short, the earliest gospel was not good advice,

[1] C. F. Andrews, *Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas*, 93.

but Good News. It told of a Divine act rather than of a Divine demand. It is what we have learned in our day to call the *Kerygma*. For the earliest Christians the central thing was not the Sermon on the Mount but the Cross on the Hill and the Empty Tomb, and the power and glory of God made manifest therein.

The other way to settle the matter is to read the Sermon on the Mount itself and consider gravely just what it involves. If some people did this thoughtfully, they would be less ready to cry out, 'Give us less theology and more Sermon on the Mount.' Let any man seriously consider what is implied, say, in Christ's exposition of the 'higher righteousness' (Mt 5^{21-48}), and then let him ask himself what good news—what gospel—is to be found there. If God means that, in order to be saved, we must completely fulfil all these demands, then we are all doomed to be damned.

No, the Sermon on the Mount is not the gospel. How it is related to it, we have yet to consider. Let it be sufficient meantime to say that if the heart of the earliest gospel is the coming of the Reign of God in Jesus Christ incarnate, crucified and risen, the Sermon preserves for us Christ's own design for life in that Kingdom.

II

The Sermon, then, being part of Jesus' 'good advice' rather than of His 'good news,' the question arises, What kind of moral manifesto is it?

Prima facie, the Sermon seems so simple and straightforward that a man might be pardoned for supposing that there would not be much difference of opinion about its interpretation. Yet scholars in this century have held almost as many views of it as of the Preacher Himself. Let us look at only four of them now.

We may start with Tolstoy who exemplifies the literal and legalistic approach to the Sermon. It is well known how in his latter days the great Russian novelist turned social reformer and found the blue-print for his new society in the Sermon. For him, it was the new law of Jesus abrogating the old law of Moses, and its kernel was to be found in Mt 5^{21-48} with its commandments to be literally obeyed. 'Swear not at all,' said Jesus. This means (argued Tolstoy) an end to all oaths, even in law-courts. 'Resist not evil,' said Jesus. This means: scrap the police force and other resisters of evil. (It can also mean: let thugs and gangsters have their own sweet way. But Tolstoy did not worry about this.) In fine, the Sermon was the new moral law for Christians, to be strictly and literally fulfilled. Let men only do this, and we should have the Kingdom of God on earth.

How differently the Kingdom appeared to Albert Schweitzer of Alsace! For him it was completely eschatological, to be understood only in terms of pre-Christian Messianism and apocalyptic. So far from being any sort of man-made Paradise on earth, it meant the catastrophic irruption of God into history, bringing with it the Day of Judgment and an abrupt end to this world as we know it. The imminence of this Kingdom was the burden of Jesus' preaching. What then are we to make of the ethic of Jesus in general and of the Sermon in particular? Schweitzer's answer is famous: 'an ethic for an interim.' Just as in war-time exceptional laws are promulgated to cover the time of emergency, so Jesus' ethic was an emergency ethic for His disciples' use during the brief interval between His preaching and the cataclysmic coming of the Kingdom of God. Since, however, the world did not come to an end in A.D. 30, the ethic of Jesus can have little obvious relevance for Christians in the twentieth century. (Schweitzer's own career since then is a glorious refutation of what seems the logic of his theory.)

Neither Tolstoy nor Schweitzer made many converts to their views. A much more popular approach to the Sermon in this century has been to regard it as a *Gesinnungs-ethik*—'an ethic of attitude.' Herrmann and Dibelius took this view. Jesus (they said) was not laying down laws at all. He was indicating attitudes and suggesting the essential inward disposition which ought to characterize His disciples. Spiritual freedom, not any new legalism, was His concern, and He knew that the development of moral personality comes with such freedom. Therefore His ethical teaching, often expressed in the form of sharp paradox, deals with what we should *be* rather than with what we should *do*. The danger in this view is that we may be tempted to water down our Lord's teaching; but it has at least this merit (which Schweitzer's had not) that it makes Christ's teaching usable by the modern disciple.

The fourth and last view we will notice may be called the dogmatic approach. It recognizes the rigour of Christ's teaching in the Sermon, and proposes a theological way-out. A notable German expositor of this view was the late Gerhard Kittel, first editor of the famous *Wörterbuch*. English readers will find a similar approach in Dr. A. R. Vidler's *Christ's Strange Work*. 'The Sermon on the Mount,' says Vidler,[1] 'is not the essence of Christianity; it is the fulfilment of the Law rather than of the gospel. Since it discloses

[1] *Op. cit.*, 63.

what is implied in the Old Law, it is a terrifying summons to repentance, and the culminating part of Christ's strange work. As we listen to His words that shall never pass away, we find ourselves under the spell of a kind of righteousness to which we cannot even begin to attain.' Thus, the purpose of the Sermon is to bring home to us the awful fact that we are sinners, and so prepare us for Christ's proper work, which is the forgiveness of sins made possible by His atoning death.

What is the Sermon on the Mount? A new law? An ethic for the interim? A *Gesinnungsethik*? Or a terrifying summons to repentance? None of these answers is devoid of its element of truth. St. Matthew, at any rate, would like us to think of it as a new law. Since we live 'between the times,' in a sense the ethic of the Sermon is an ethic for those who live between the coming of the Kingdom and its final consummation. Because the Sermon gives us 'direction, rather than directions,' and is deeply concerned with being rather than doing, we may say that it is an ethic of attitude and disposition. And it is a plain fact of experience that the Sermon, by its revelation of the pure will of God, does reveal to us our sinfulness and our desperate need of Divine forgiveness.

III

This short survey of twentieth-century interpretations of the Sermon has prepared the way for the constructive part of this article. We propose to put forward four theses concerning the ethic of the Sermon.

(1) It is a religious ethic.
(2) It is a disciples' ethic.
(3) It is a prophetic ethic, not a new law.
(4) It is an unattainable ethic which, as Christians, we must yet try to attain.

(1) It is a religious ethic. Few will dispute this. Biblical ethics always presuppose Biblical religion, or rather they grow out of it, are its practical expression in life and conduct. This is true of the Decalogue. It is no less true of the Sermon. Its postulate is faith in God—faith in the Father whom He revealed—as its sanctions—rewards and punishments, the imitation of God, etc.—are religious sanctions. But we must go further than this. Jesus' ethic implies the whole gospel of the Reign of God which was the central theme of His preaching. And Jesus declared that that Reign had now arrived—had begun with Himself and in His ministry.

So we have to do with both a Divine indicative and a Divine imperative. But the imperative is founded on the indicative. The indicative may be expressed like this: 'God has manifested His saving Rule in Christ.' The imperative will then run something like this: 'Therefore let all who accept the Rule of God live in a new way—the Kingdom way.' What the new way should be, the Sermon tells us.

(2) It is a disciples' ethic. This is really a corollary of the previous conclusion. The Sermon is fundamentally disciple-teaching. It is addressed to those who are to be the nucleus of the new Israel.

Even if St. Matthew had not told us that the disciples formed the audience for the Sermon, there is enough in it to lead us to the same conclusion. The Beatitudes are clearly addressed to 'committed' men. The Lord's Prayer is a Disciples' Prayer. 'Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples.' The sayings about salt and light point in the same direction. And many other sayings in the Sermon, including the final Parable of the Two Houses, are obviously spoken to men prepared at any rate to make the venture of discipleship.

The point need not be laboured, for our experts are agreed about it. 'Spoken not to the world but to the Church,' says Gore.[1] 'Given to the new Israel,' comments T. W. Manson.[2] 'Ripe teaching for ripe disciples,' declares Montefiore.[3]

(3) 'The Sermon on the Mount,' said B. W. Bacon, 'is not legislative but prophetic. It does not enact, but interprets. It does not lay down rules, but opens up principles.'[4] James Denney said the same thing in a letter to Sir William Robertson Nicoll: 'It would be a great point gained if people would only consider that it was a Sermon and was *preached*, not an *act* which was passed.'[5]

All down the Christian centuries, from St. Matthew's day to Tolstoy's, some men have tried to find in the Sermon a new law. The proof that it is not such is in the Sermon itself, as A. D. Lindsay has shown: 'Human laws are based on calculations of how most men may reasonably be expected to behave. It is assumed that with a reasonable amount of effort such rules will get themselves kept. A law that is not going to be kept, which asks of people more than they are most of them at all intending to give, is a bad law. It would be of no use making a law or moral code in order to put pressure on men and women to be saints. That the Sermon on the Mount does ask us to be exactly this, in itself shows that it cannot

[1] *The Sermon on the Mount*, 15.
[2] *The Teaching of Jesus*, 294.
[3] *The Synoptic Gospels*, ii. 27.
[4] *The Sermon on the Mount*, 109.
[5] *Letters to William Robertson Nicoll*, 71.

both be regarded seriously and yet treated as legislation. For Jesus told men not as a command but as a revelation and a hope that men are to be perfect even as our Father in heaven is perfect.' [1]

In other words, the ethic of the Sermon does not begin to square with what we understand by law.

We reach the same conclusion if we consider Jesus' conflicts with the Scribes and Pharisees and the religion of legalism generally; for at bottom it is a conflict between the prophetic spirit, which deals with persons and principles, and the legalist approach, which always wishes to frame a code of morals telling people how they must act in any particular case. But we need not elaborate the argument here, for it has been admirably expounded by Professor T. W. Manson in his *Teaching of Jesus* (p. 300 f.). Christ does not traffic, as the legalist does, in rules and regulations to cover every conceivable act of conduct. He lays down deep and far-ranging principles. He enunciates the aims and ideals which ought to govern the lives of men who are living in that new order of grace which Jesus calls the Kingdom of God.

(4) 'All this Sermon on the Mount business,' says one of Rose Macaulay's characters, 'is most saddening. Because it's about impossibilities. You can receive a sacrament, and you can find salvation, but you can't live the Sermon on the Mount.'

This *dictum* poses the final question, 'Can we *use* the Sermon on the Mount to-day, and if so, how?'

Most of us would agree that, as Christians, we cannot dodge the issue, either by saying with the man of the world, 'You can't live the Sermon on the Mount, because it's about impossibilities,' or with the Roman Catholic Church, 'This teaching is not for the rank and file of Christians but for a certain few specially called to lead the religious life.' Christ in the Sermon does set before us a real design for living which challenges every earnest Christian. He does tell us (1) the kind of people we ought to be; (2) the influence we ought to exert in the world; (3) the kind of way in which we ought to behave socially; (4) the kind of worship we ought to give God; (5) the attitude we ought to have towards earthly and heavenly treasures; and (6) the way in which we ought to treat our fellow-men.

'Relevant in this sense,' a man may admit, 'but is the Sermon practicable?'

Here, it seems to me, we must avoid two extreme ways of answering the question. First, we must reject the view which holds that the purpose of the Sermon is simply to 'knock us down'—to show us how utterly we come short of the pure will of God. Jesus meant the Sermon to be a good deal more than a mere counsel of God's perfection; or what is the point of the Parable of the Two Houses? On the other hand, those who hold that Jesus meant His precepts in the Sermon to be practised and that men do in fact live according to the pattern shown them in the Sermon, seem to be refuted by the argument from experience. When Hans Windisch argued for the 'fulfillability' of the Sermon, Rudolf Bultmann replied with an *ad hominem* question, 'Will Windisch claim that he fulfils the demands of the Sermon on the Mount? Or does he assume that some other man does? Then why not?' [2]

Yet Jesus meant His ethic to be more than a blue-print for Utopia. Further, we must never forget that the Sermon is an ethic for those who call Christ Lord and Saviour, for those who have entered the Kingdom of God and are promised the power and help of the Holy Spirit. In other words, we are not asked to scale the heights of the Sermon in our own unaided strength.

In that assurance we can face the challenge of its demands. And beyond question the Sermon does give us stimulus and guidance for the adventure of Christian living. Its standards ought to be before us when we make the personal decisions of Christian action. In any given moral dilemma, the Christian may ask himself, 'What light and leading may I derive from the principles and precepts of my Lord, as I know them from the Sermon?' And having done this, he will be the better able to deal with specific moral choices.

The Sermon, then, is our standard and ideal. Of course, it will always be beyond us. That is as it should be—

> . . . a man's reach should exceed his grasp,
> Or what's a heaven for?

Yet if none of us ever reaches the heights to which Christ summons us, this is but an illustration of the tension between the ideal and the actual which must ever mark the life of Christ's disciples in this world. For we have to live our lives at once as citizens of this world, with all its trials and temptations, and as citizens of the Kingdom of God.

Our conclusion is that of Professor William Manson. 'Christ's ethic stands for the unattainable which we are yet bound to attain.' [3] Though we, even as the first disciples, can never hope to reach the ideal in this fallen world, we are summoned day by day, with the help of the Holy Spirit, to make the effort.

[1] *The Moral Teaching of Jesus*, 96 f.

[2] *Glauben und Verstehen*, 199.

[3] *Jesus the Messiah*, 85.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

'For Me'

By the Reverend Wilfrid J. Doidge, B.A., B.D., Carshalton, Surrey

'Who loved me, and gave himself up for me.'—Gal 2^{20} (R.V.).

There are so many millions of people in the world, and some of them so very important, that it seems quite foolish for ordinary people like you and me to think that the great God of all loves each one, one by one. Yet this is what Jesus taught people, and it is one of the loveliest truths we can ever know. Paul knew how wonderful it was when he wrote, 'who loved *me*, and gave himself up for *me*.'

One beautiful October morning I saw something which helped me to see what Paul meant. I had arrived at London Bridge station, and was about to hurry across the bridge when I saw the sun just rising above the tall buildings on the south side of the River Thames. I stopped to look down the river. Beyond Tower Bridge, which, as you know, stands a little way down, the sunshine covered the whole of the river. The little waves sparkled and gleamed in the light, and everything was bathed in sunshine. Then, just as I turned to hurry on, I noticed that from Tower Bridge to London Bridge the light did not appear to cover everything, but there was a beam of light which came across the water, becoming narrower and narrower and narrower until it stopped right under my feet.

I hurried on, but it was such a beautiful morning that I stopped at the middle of the bridge and looked down the river again. Beyond Tower Bridge everything was flooded in sunshine, but from Tower Bridge to London Bridge I saw once more my beam of light. It came across the water, getting narrower and narrower and narrower until it stopped right under my feet.

Time was passing and I had to hurry on again, but it was such a sunny morning that when I came to the north end of the bridge I had to take a last look down the river. And there it was again! Beyond Tower Bridge the light covered everything, and was shared by all. From Tower Bridge to London Bridge my beam of light came across the water, getting narrower and narrower and narrower until it stopped right under my feet.

As I crossed the road to Cannon Street the thought came suddenly to me—that's just like God's love: it covers everybody in all the world, but when you stop to look at it and think about it, it seems to come to you alone as though there were no other people in the world. No wonder Paul's words came to my mind, 'who loved *me* and gave himself up for *me*.' Then I remembered the words of St. Augustine, who said about God: 'Thou carest for everyone of us, as if Thou carest for him only; and so for all as if there were but one.'

A Dry Old Stick

By the Reverend Charles M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff

'As a root out of a dry ground.'—Is 53^{2}.

Some years ago a friend of mine was minister in a small parish with a lovely Scotch name, Inverarity. One morning the laird's gardener presented one of the younger members of the minister's family with a tiny shoot from a fig tree. It was then planted with his help in a sheltered corner of the Manse garden. Although it was given all possible care, it did not show much sign of development. After two years the minister was asked to go to Glasgow to a crowded quarter of the city. One of the questions for the young people was, should their fig-shoot be taken with them and planted again where the conditions and climate might not be very favourable? In the end they agreed to risk it; so the shoot went with them and was carefully transplanted into the rather sooty soil of the city. Alas, it languished very sadly. It looked as though the experiment was not succeeding. Indeed, when people saw it in its plot they said it was only 'a dry old stick,' that it was dead. Soon they got to thinking themselves it was simply what their father said the Bible called 'a cumberer of the ground.' But in the fourth season there was great excitement because it began to show signs of life; while in the sixth season there was not only a mass of leaves, but even a bunch of very small green figs. Those who said 'throw it out!' were wrong. It was not dead. It was only dormant or sleeping. It showed in its own time that it was alive.

Isn't that the sort of marvel that we see in Spring-time, things that seemed to be dry and dead becoming alive? A miner, who worked away down in the darkness of the earth, said that it opened his eyes one day when his tiny tot of three years of age burst breathlessly into their cottage clutching in her fat little hand a few sprays of tiny young leaves.

'Daddy!' she chattered, and her eyes were

shining with excitement, 'Daddy! all the trees have cummed alive again!'

Yes, and when you see them in the winter they look like dead skeletons, don't they? Or when you lift up a little bulb, all 'ragged and rusty brown,' it looks so shrivelled and dried up, and lifeless, doesn't it? Yet life, wonderful life, is in both of them, in the trees, and in the bulb, waiting to break out and bloom so gloriously all in good time.

Such wonders as these in the world of Nature should make us think of the great event of Easter. For on Good Friday our Saviour was crucified, and died. Yes, He was dead. He freely offered up His life upon the Cross for the like of you and me. His foes no doubt thought and said in their hearts 'He's done for now!' Only, one or two of them were not so sure. So they set their sentries outside the tomb. But it all came about as He had said. Because on the third day He rose again. He had been dead, but was alive. He was seen by Mary, by the disciples and others too. Not only was He seen, He spoke to them also. It is for that Divine event we give God thanks at Easter-time.

Listen now to a little poem telling us of the life and gladness of this lovely season.

Lo, I heard an eggshell crack,
And a chick came popping through.

Then a blackbird, glossy black,
Sang 'My dreams have all come true.'

Look, such fields of daffodillies,
Little Easter lambs, and lilies,
Sheaves and sheaves of silver lilies.

Then a child from Heaven said,
Bending down his starry head,
'Christ is risen from the dead.'

The Christian Year

PASSION SUNDAY

God Active in Evil

BY THE REVEREND D. H. C. READ, B.D., EDINBURGH

'And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God.'—Ro 8^{28}.

'We know.' St. Paul is announcing a *Christian conviction.* What follows isn't a commonly accepted platitude; otherwise he would have said 'It is generally known.' Nor is it a pious guess; otherwise he would have said 'We hope.' What he is doing is to proclaim an absolute certainty that ought to be possessed by all Christian people concerning the experiences that come to us, the situations we have to deal with in this unpredictable world.

What is that certainty? In view of the fact that every one of us has either gone through a time of deep distress when all the lights go out, or is going through it now, or will go through it in days to come—for I doubt if any one escapes—I don't think we could do anything more useful than to discover exactly what this master-conviction really is that can carry us through.

We are dealing with a promise of God, signed and sealed by Jesus Christ Himself. When we have discovered what it is we can stake our lives on it with the most absolute confidence, for there is nothing in this quivering world so sure and certain as the promise of the living God.

Unfortunately, there is something misleading in the way this verse is translated for us in the Authorized Version. 'All things work together for good' is not what St. Paul said, but the phrase is so neat and memorable that it is often quoted as if it gave a complete and satisfying answer to all the troubles that befall us. Taken by itself, in isolation from the condition that is attached, it is simply not true. All things do not work together for good. That is an entirely fatalistic philosophy. It is equivalent to saying that 'whatever is, is right.' And even when we take the complete quotation—'All things work together for good to them that love God'—in what sense is that true? Here is the kind of story one hears, something that really happened to a believing Christian man. He had a son who meant the world to him. Just as he was about to start on his career came the 1914 War. In a few months the father received the news that the boy had been severely wounded, paralysed down one side, and unlikely to live. He prayed for that boy's life, and his prayer was granted. Then he prayed that he might be able to walk again, and his prayer was granted. The life that had been threatened was given back. But what did the son do with it? In an attempt to relieve pain he took to drink, made nothing of his new-found life, and died the other day. Could one write to that father and say, 'All things work together for good to them that love God'? Or could one say it with any conviction to the thousands of parents whose prayers for a soldier's life were not answered? Isn't it our experience that things often seem to work for good to those who never give God a thought, while the most Christian people have often to face situations where all things seem to be working together for evil?

It is a tremendous help to our understanding of this text if we turn to a more accurate translation of the Greek. The best I have found is the rendering

in the American Revision Standard Version of the New Testament. There we read : ' We know that in everything God works for good with those who love him.' Let us see what that promise means.

It means that God is active to bring good out of every single thing that happens to us. That is very different from saying that everything that happens to us is good. It is not good to be maimed in body or spirit ; it is not good to lose some one we love ; it is not good to be involved in war ; it is not good to be deprived of a natural outlet for our instincts or talents. But in all these things—and in every private blow that we have to suffer—God is active for good. That is the promise. ' In *everything* '—absolutely everything that has happened, or can happen to us, God is working positively, so that it is always possible for something good to emerge. What a glorious promise that is—that not even the worst that can befall us can ever be written off as unmitigated evil, but *always* this transforming power of God is there to create, even from the ashes of our despair, new life, new values, new powers—that which is good.

The story of Joseph and his brothers is a dramatic example of the Bible promise of good out of evil. Joseph, as a young man, was the victim of the jealousy of his brothers. As he was carried off a prisoner to Egypt there would have been little use in telling him that ' all things work together for good.' It is not good to be marched day after day on an empty stomach to a foreign land. It is not good to be cut off from home and kindred. And yet—what happened ? Joseph in Egypt won the favour of the Pharaoh, worked his way into a position of power and influence, and eventually became Minister of Food for the whole country. And as a result he was able to rescue his father and brothers from starvation in a time of famine. That is how Joseph casts his mind back over the mysterious events of his life and says to his brothers—the men who had sold him into slavery—' As for you, ye thought evil against me ; but *God meant it unto good.*'

' In everything God works for good.' That does not always mean that we come out on top in the eyes of the world like Joseph ; but it does mean that God can use every circumstance as the raw material for the shaping of a new and unexpected good. Usually we cannot see it happening at the time. It is only afterwards, as we look back, that we can trace this mysterious hand of God working for good—good for our own souls, good for the work of His Kingdom—in the very things that looked like sheer calamity.

' We know that in everything God works for good with those who love Him.' Suppose some real disaster hits us, or that we are faced, as many are, with some agonizing situation from which there seems no escape. We can simply let it overwhelm us, lose all hope and faith, and carry about with us in the secret of our hearts that most crippling of all afflictions—a grudge against God. It is not for us to condemn those who have made that response—probably most Christians have come nearer to it at times than they would care to admit. But, surely we must gently say : ' That is not the answer : out of one evil you are making many more.' In Aldous Huxley's play, *The Giaconda Smile,* we are shown a man unjustly condemned for murder. In the cell awaiting execution he is so overwhelmed with the monstrous calamity that has overtaken him that he hammers his hands against the door until they are torn and bleeding. To him comes his friend the doctor. Quietly he speaks to him of the futility of his inner revolt, and in the end the hands drop down, and in his heart he finds the peace of acceptance. How many people with bleeding hands need this strong and understanding friend who will stand by them till they cease to hammer against the universe and wear themselves out in vain.

But what is this acceptance ? It could be sheer fatalism.

> The Moving Finger writes ; and, having writ,
> Moves on : nor all your Piety nor Wit
> Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line,
> Nor all your Tears wash out a Word of it.

There is a noble Stoicism which has enabled many a good man or woman to endure calamity. But that is not the Christian answer. We are not to batter ourselves against the evil in vain revolt, nor are we to accept it passively in the dumb hope that ' all things work together for good.' We have the promise that ' God works in everything for good with those who love Him ' ; and we are to seek in the evil that has come upon us this recreative power of God for good.

This is a promise of God, signed and sealed by Jesus Christ. For it is in Christ Himself that we find the real assurance of this tremendous truth. If I were asked *why* I believe that God does in fact always and everywhere work to bring good out of evil with those who love Him, I should not just give the witness of my own limited experience : I should point to the great inescapable Fact on which the Christian gospel is based—the crucifixion of Jesus. There was evil, snarling, hideous, triumphant over innocence. There was the terrible sense of abandonment—' My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me ? ' But there was no rebellion. These hands were not bleeding from a vain battering against heaven. They were the sign of His acceptance, His active, positive acceptance in the knowledge that the Divine power for good was at

work—there, even there, where men saw nothing but the hand of cruel Fate. 'Father into thy hands I commend my spirit.' And what happened? From that most terrible of all evils, from that grimmest of all tragedies has come the mightiest tide of goodness and love that has ever flowed through the hearts of men. Good out of evil. The greatest good out of the greatest evil. That is why we can stake our lives on this promise of God. That is why 'we *know* that in everything God works for good with those who love Him.'

Jesus loved Him utterly and perfectly. And so the greatest good—the salvation of the world—came from His agony on the Cross. 'God works . . . with those who love Him.' There is nothing automatic about this bringing of good out of evil. It depends all the time on our being in touch with God. He promises us, not His omnipotence, but His co-operation. There is only one way to be sure that we shall partake of the promise of good out of evil, and that is to 'keep ourselves in the love of God.' If we do that, by prayer, by worship, by Christian service, then we are fore-armed for all that may come to us, knowing that 'in everything God works for good with those who love Him.'

PALM SUNDAY

King on a Colt

BY THE REVEREND J. ITHEL JONES, M.A., B.D., LONDON.

'Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass. And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off: and he shall speak peace unto the heathen: and his dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth.'—Zech 9^{9-10}.

A stranger reading the gospel story for the first time might well consider the events of Palm Sunday to be completely misplaced. For here is Jesus planning to ride in triumph at the very time in which He faces His Cross. It would be reasonable on the face of it for this story to come on the Sunday after Easter rather than on the Sunday before.

It is in this apparent misplacement, of course, that the whole significance of the incident lies. Jesus is so sure of His triumph that He celebrates it before achieving it. He has such faith in the ultimate vindication of His cause that when the shadow of the Cross is upon Him He sees the crown. The chief priests are planning to kill Him and He rides into the city as a king. It is as though He should say to the world about Him, 'Do your very worst; try Me, condemn Me, scourge Me, kill Me; I'll come out of it all triumphant.' Here was a faith daring enough to celebrate victory before the battle had been fought. He shows that inner certainty He possessed that His Kingdom cannot fail.

On Palm Sunday, as we, too, celebrate His kingship, it is well for us to ask what sort of a Kingdom this is of whose triumph He is so sure. What are its characteristics?

What better can we do than turn to the prophecy in Zechariah which is indissolubly linked with the incidents of Palm Sunday and which our Lord Himself seems to have been at pains to fulfil before the eyes of all? For the carefully planned hire of the beasts and the prearranged password seem to point to the fact that Jesus was quite unashamedly building up in the minds of the people a picture with which Zechariah had already made them familiar.

And if this prophecy loomed large in our Lord's thought at this time, we cannot go far astray if we turn to it also in our inquiry into the nature of His Kingdom.

1. The first thing about the Kingdom as depicted by Zechariah is that *it will not, and cannot be set up by force.* Ephraim had trusted in chariots and Jerusalem in horses. They recognized the sway of brute force. But now, says God, '. . . I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off.'

Let that word sink right into our hearts. When Jesus rode in triumph into Jerusalem it was not on a white charger but on an ass. This was an unmistakable sign that His weapons are humility and gentleness and love. Religions have been spread by force of arms before now. Military conquest accounts in some measure for the way in which Muhammadanism has covered a large part of the earth.

This King will have nothing of that. His followers must be able to say with the Psalmist, 'Some trust in chariots, and some in horses: but we will remember the name of the Lord our God.'

Let it be said that this is not the pacifism issue. There are those who think that in certain circumstances war is inescapable, who still realise that Christ's Kingdom is never established by war. We may consider ourselves to be fighting for something very valuable. We may even use such words as 'freedom' and 'justice' in describing what it is we seek to preserve. But these things are not to be identified with the Kingdom of God which is the rule of God in the hearts of men. War may stay the evil hand. Establish this Kingdom it cannot.

The tendency to use wrong weapons shows itself from time to time. A Samaritan village refuses to hear the good news, and James and John want the Master to call down fire from heaven. There is rebuke as well as endearment in their nickname—'thunderbolts.'

The King and His Kingdom are not to be defended by the sword that cut off Malchus' ear in the Garden. Even the twelve legions of angels that might be at His disposal cannot be used for this purpose. Earth's kingdoms are established by force and by means of military and political strategy. His Kingdom is not of this world. Else would His followers fight. Nay, the chariot is cut off from Ephraim and the horse from Jerusalem.

2. *The Kingdom is to be spread by the proclaiming of good news.* 'And he shall speak peace unto the heathen.'

Now, that expression does not mean 'let's be friends with other nations.' It includes that, of course, but in the first instance it means something quite different. This phrase 'to speak peace' seems to have a meaning all its own in Scripture. It is almost invariably associated with the proclaiming of the good news of God. On that night in which our Lord was born the angels sang of peace on earth. Of the reason for their song we are left in no doubt: it had to do with the good tidings of great joy that a Saviour had been born in the city of David. Speaking peace is almost synonymous with the bringing of good news of what God has done for our salvation. The two expressions are brought together in the celebrated exclamation in Isaiah, 'How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation. . . .'

And so, 'he shall speak peace unto the heathen' does not mean the establishing of friendly relations among the peoples on a humanistic basis. It means bringing the peace of God to the hearts of men by making known to them the good news of the gospel.

That is the way in which this Kingdom is extended. From the standpoint of the Kingdom of God, therefore, the smuggling of William Carey into India one hundred and sixty years ago is of more significance than Constantine's victory at Milvian Bridge early in the fourth century. The Kingdom does not really spread when we use compulsion, whether it be military, civil, or economic.

'He shall speak peace unto the heathen.' It's the slow way. The Kingdom spreads by bringing the King's rule to the hearts and lives of men. Our Lord's victory in the wilderness consisted in His rejection of the other way. He chose the way of the Cross on which He died for sin. And His choice enabled Him in the end to gather His disciples about Him and say to them, 'All power is given unto me . . . .' And the way He exercised that power was by their going into all the world preaching the gospel.

3. And finally, that Kingdom of whose triumph Christ was so sure *is universal in its extent.* '. . . his dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth.'

Jesus shall reign where'er the sun
Doth his successive journeys run.

He didn't look very much like it on that first Palm Sunday morning seated on the colt and surrounded by a crowd of children with their parents. Had we been there, we should not have been in the least impressed. In fact, we would probably have laughed and dismissed the whole affair with a toss of the head. His dominion was a little ridiculous and His entourage rather pathetic. 'His dominion shall be from sea even to sea.' Indeed?

The astonishing thing is that this incredible prophecy is coming true. There is much in the international situation to-day to discourage Christians. But let us remember amid all our misgivings that there is no quarter of the earth where that strange Man on a royal beast has not ridden with some measure of triumph. His day is still young, and His ascendancy grows at a remarkable pace. Iron curtains assume different proportions when we recall that during the last one hundred and fifty years more people have been won for Christ than in the previous eighteen centuries of the Christian era. Men have come in their millions from the East and West and have sat down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven.

It is not fanaticism but sober reflection that prompts us to sing on Palm Sunday, 1952

Gird Thy sword on, mighty Hero
Make the word of truth Thy car;
Prosper in Thy course majestic;
All success attend Thy war:
Gracious Victor,
Let mankind before Thee bow.

Good Friday

Tetelestai

By Professor A. M. Hunter, Ph.D., D.Phil., D.D., University of Aberdeen

'It is finished.'—Jn 19[30].

As on this day, at the ninth hour—3 p.m. our time—in the year A.D. 30, Jesus Christ died on a Cross outside the northern wall of Jerusalem His

last utterance, according to St. John, was one brief, triumphant word: '*Tetelestai!* It is finished!'

From that day to this a multitude whom no man can number and who swear eternal allegiance to that crucified Man, believing Him to be Divine, have cried 'Amen' to that last ringing word of His, persuaded that when He died, the divinest work in all history had been carried to a victorious conclusion.

'Finished!' He said. But what was finished? You will find the answer in that saying which Christ uttered by the Well in Samaria: 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work.' It was God's work—the work that the Father had given him to do—which was finished upon the Cross.

What was this work? We will try to answer the question from Christ's own words—more particularly from three picture-phrases which He Himself used.

1. First, then, Christ saw His Passion and Death as a *cup* to be drunk.

'Can you drink of the cup that I am drinking?' He said to James and John. 'O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me,' He prayed in the Garden of Gethsemane.

A cup? What did Christ mean by this cup which the Father had given Him? As a rule, we use the word for some joyful experience, saying in hours of great happiness, 'My cup is filled to overflowing.' But in the Bible a cup more often signifies some bitter experience. It represents a lot appointed by God—and that lot generally one of affliction. It is a cup of anguish and woe. And such, beyond all doubt, was the cup of which Christ spoke.

Was it then the actual physical pain of the Cross—the pain of death by crucifixion—which was uppermost in His mind when He used the word? Nay verily. To be sure, death by crucifixion was cruel enough in all conscience—*crudelissimum teterrimumque supplicium*, says Cicero, 'cruellest and foulest of punishments'; yet hundreds before Christ had endured it bravely. There is more to it than physical pain. Surely James Denney is right when he says: 'It is hard to believe that it was simply the anticipation of pain which made Christ cry "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." It was the anticipation of that experience when, all sinless as He was, the Father would put into His hands the cup our sins had mingled.'

'The cup our sins had mingled.' This was the cup Christ had to drink. So closely had He associated Himself with those He came to save—in Maltby's phrase, so irrevocably had He betrothed Himself to the human race for better, for worse—that Christ tasted, in all its horror, the wrath of God against the sin of man; and for one dread moment during the agony it seemed as if the cup would prove too bitter for Him—

> A voice upon the midnight air
> Where Kidron's moonlit waters stray
> Weeps forth in agony of prayer:
> 'O Father, take this cup away!'
> 'Ah, Thou who sorrowest unto death,
> We conquer in Thy mortal fray,
> And earth for all her children saith:
> "O God, take not this cup away!"'

It was not taken away. He had to drink it in all its bitterness, even to enduring on the Cross that awful sense of separation from God which wrung from Him the most desolating cry in history, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' But He drank it to the dregs; and when He died, He knew the cup was empty. 'It is finished.' Whatever else that saying means, it means that when Christ died, He had drained the cup His Father had given Him, the cup our sins had mingled.

2. Secondly, Christ saw His Passion as a *road* to be travelled. 'The Son of man goeth as it is written of him,' He said, foretelling His death. We might fill out the saying thus: 'The Son of man is travelling the road mapped out for Him in Scripture.' And if we ask what road in Scripture He means, there can be but one answer. It is that *via dolorosa*, that path of shame and death, mapped out centuries before, in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah—the chapter which tells of the Suffering Servant of God, despised and rejected of men, who 'bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.'

Of course, it is a road of the spirit which Christ knew He had to travel; yet as we read the Gospels, we see how it leads Christ through one actual place after another in Galilee and Judea. It begins at the Baptism, on the banks of Jordan; it winds through that barren Wilderness near the Dead Sea where He was tempted to swerve aside from the sombre way appointed for Him and to take the broad easy highway of the world and of the devil; it takes a decisive turning-point at Caesarea Philippi when 'he sets his face stedfastly to go to Jerusalem.' From that point onwards, the road slopes down into the dark valley till, at the lowest descent thereof, there falls across His path, stark and appalling, the shadow of a Cross. Yet on He presses, resolute and unflinching, on to the end of the road—

> On to the city of God,

till with the long, last mile behind Him and the Hill of Calvary climbed He can cry at journey's

ending, 'It is finished! I have travelled the road!'

3. Last of all, Christ saw His Passion as a *price* to be paid. 'The Son of man,' He said, 'came not to be served but to serve and to give His life a ransom for many.'

A ransom for many . . . a price to be paid. What does this mean? Dead seas of ink have been expended on this great saying, and every word of it has been studied and weighed by the scholars. Yet after all their study no one has ever fathomed all its depths—

> But none of the ransomed ever knew
> How deep were the waters crossed.

Yet whatever else it means, it means this at least, that by their sin the lives of the many had become forfeit, and that Christ knew Himself called by the sacrifice of His own sinless life, to release them from the doom which overhung them. A price had to be paid, and that price the life of the only Son of God—

> There was no other good enough
> To pay the price of sin.

So Christ conceived His work; so He set Himself to fulfil it through tears and bloody sweat; so, at the last, when He hung dying on the Cross, He knew that the awful price had been paid, and with His triumphant *tetelestai* He gave up His soul to God.

'It is finished.' In Christ's own picture-phrases this means: 'I have drained the cup. I have travelled the road. I have paid the price.' Metaphors all of them, no doubt; perhaps only in metaphors could our Lord describe His work ere it was done. But the work was finished, and of the results of that finished work Christians all down the centuries have never doubted.

A well-known picture at Catterick Camp painted during the First World War shows a signaller lying dead in No-man's-land. He had been sent out to repair a cable broken by shell-fire. There he lies cold in death but with his task fulfilled. For in his stiffening hands he holds together the cable's broken ends. Beneath the picture is the one word 'Through.'

That is a picture-parable of what Christians believe about the finished work of Jesus Christ. Sin had snapped the contact between God and man. Christ by His death had brought the broken ends together, had restored the broken fellowship between God and man.

> O love of God! O sin of man!
> In this dread act your strength is tried,
> And victory remains with love;
> Jesus, our Lord, is crucified!

Easter Sunday

The Quietness of the Easter Morning

By the Reverend R. J. Wedderspoon, M.A., Cheam, Surrey

'Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master.' —Jn 20[16].

In a book that will surely live, *The Vanished Pomps of Yesterday*, Lord Frederic Hamilton described, amongst many other aspects of life in Russia as it used to be, the celebration of the famous midnight Mass in St. Isaac's Cathedral in what was then known as St. Petersburg. At eleven-thirty the crowded church was in total darkness, but all around the building were tens of thousands of unlighted candles. Each candle had its wick touched with kerosene, and all the candles were connected by means of a thread of gun-cotton which ran right round the building, so that, at the appropriate moment the whole church might blaze into light. The only music was that of priests chanting the Russian Office for the Dead. But on the stroke of midnight all was changed. The guns of the fortress boomed out, and inside the Cathedral the gun-cotton was touched off, the swift flash kindled the tens of thousands of candles round the building, and the enormous congregation lit the tapers they carried. The Royal Doors were thrown open, and with the choir bursting into the Easter anthem the Easter Mass began. 'Nothing,' wrote Lord Frederic, 'more poignantly dramatic could possibly be imagined than this almost instantaneous change from intense gloom to blazing light, from the darkness of the tomb to the glories of the Resurrection. I never tired of witnessing this splendid piece of symbolism.'

Now it is true that all such gorgeous ceremonial has its own form of impressiveness, especially for certain types of mind, and it is also true that our own much more restrained services emphasize triumph and victory throughout the whole course of them on Easter Day. It could not well be otherwise. Bach in his Mass in B Minor achieves the same dramatic effect as that of the Russian Cathedral. The words, 'He suffered, and was buried, and was dead,' are heard sinking in low diminishing throbs into silence, and are followed by the great outburst, 'He rose again.' Indeed the tremendous contrast between Crucifixion and Resurrection is fastened upon somehow or other by all churches. This, surely, each church declares, is the great day of the Christian year. Why then should there be any restraint in the expression of our joy? Reach out for the trumpet! And let there be a loud and swelling Hallelujah!

But that is not how the Resurrection itself

happened. There were no vivid dramatic contrasts. There were no convulsions of Nature to signalize the swift victory over death. There was no outburst of song. There was nothing at all to indicate the sudden reversal of a lever by Almighty Hands. On the contrary the Resurrection was one of the quietest events that ever occurred. It was as quiet as the coming of the dawn, as quiet as the coming of the Spirit. Its power and its appeal lie not in any thunderous accompanying voice either of Nature or of man, but in its gentle stillness, its holy quiet, its unruffled calm. We can well believe that when Jesus said 'Mary' it was in accents as soft and caressing as the south wind, and that when Mary all astonished replied and said 'Rabboni' it was in a voice little more than a whisper. This great event in the history of mankind, for great it is by any computation, came stealing upon the world in an atmosphere of breathless and adoring calm. As Alice Meynell puts it, victory was 'hushed within the dead of night.' If there were songs to hear no one appears to have heard them.

The late Canon Wilkinson, a fine writer too little known, tells how he once stood on Ben Cruachan at the breaking of the day, at the great moment when, walking unscathed, unhindered through the shadows, came the grave beauty of the dawn. 'I saw the splendour that filled the world and the majesty that crowned the hills; but the splendour and the majesty were a later revelation, and they were born of a miracle of Nature so simple and natural that it was like the waking of a little child. . . . And there was the curious sense that one has at such a time of harmonies that the spirit cannot hear but that thrill the spirit and make the silence tremble with joy.' Was it not like that in the Garden on Easter morning?

1. The quiet emphasizes the naturalness of the Resurrection. We celebrate it to-day, laying full stress on our joy at the bursting of the bonds of death and at the triumph over the powers of evil. It is but natural that we should do so, especially at a time when it might appear as if the forces of evil were very strongly entrenched. We very much require this reminder that however long the struggle may be the victory of the Kingdom is assured at the end. But we are apt for this very reason to overlook the fact that the Resurrection itself was not just a violent overturning of the ordinary course of events and a complete break with natural processes. We pile up our arguments for the truth of the Resurrection, for there are always those who feel that it is too good to be true, and the cumulative effect of the evidence that can be produced is overwhelming, calculated indeed to dislodge from his ramparts of disbelief even the most dogmatic and uncompromising sceptic. But sometimes we forget the most striking argument of all, that the Resurrection was just what you would have expected to happen. It was the most natural thing in the world, as inevitable as the dawn. For was it not the Resurrection of *Jesus*? 'It was not possible that He should be holden of death.' The real mystery would have been if He had not risen from the dead. If His Personality had been completely obliterated, if His Crucifixion had gone for nought, if all who have followed in His steps had only shared with Him a pathetic delusion, if that which has been for us the essence of our faith were to prove but the baseless fabric of a dream, then indeed we might talk of mystery and of inability to comprehend, and then also we might adopt Arthur Balfour's words, and say that we live in a singularly ill-contrived world, it is true, but it is not quite so ill-contrived as all that!

We celebrate, therefore, to-day an inevitable happening. We are not forcing our minds to leap over a terrific obstacle to faith. Rather are we rejoicing anew at this attestation of the boundless love of God, for if that amazing life had been quenched, if the final word had lain with Pilate, if there had been no answer to the scoffing of the soldiers, no reply to the hammer and the nails, then it might have been difficult for us to go on believing in the love of God in all its fullness.

2. The quietness of the Resurrection, and particularly this story that comes to us from the hush of the first Easter dawn, reminds us that the Risen Christ can be personally apprehended.

The first word that our Lord is recorded as uttering is the single word, Mary. Is it too much to suggest that however important the theological consequences of the Resurrection may be, with the assurance they give of victory over sin, and evil, and pain, and death, still more important for the individual, for you and for me, is the word addressed directly to our own condition. Is it not our own name that He utters this new Easter morning? The Bible never forgets the individual. The Christian Faith is not just concerned with large-scale philosophical belief. It is addressed to me, as I am, and where I am, this very Easter morning.

If you are here to-day with an aching heart, conscious of a great gap in your life, you will well understand what Christ's word to you means. If you are oppressed with the burden of the world's need, well, for you, too, Easter is very relevant indeed, and you are given fresh heart and hope. But does He not come to every single person, and may He not be coming this morning to issue to you not a word of consolation, but of challenge? That challenge you may evade on many another morning, but not on Easter morning, and the worst

thing that could happen to us all this day is that our ears should be so engaged by all the rapturous rejoicings of our Easter ceremonial that we should miss the quiet, holy and sublime, in which our Lord's own voice is heard.

First Sunday after Easter

Why Are We Here?

By Prebendary R. Wragge Morley, M.A.,
Rector of Church Stretton

'Each becometh wise in his own work. . . . They will maintain the fabric of the world; And in the handywork of their craft is their prayer.'—Ecclus $38^{31.\ 34}$ (R.V.).

One of the worst dangers in life is that we grow to feel hopeless, things are too much for us, we live in a day of vast issues and what can we do? And that is one of the most disintegrating forces that can play upon a character. For a feeling of insignificance and self-pity demoralizes.

When we feel like that, looking at life and seeing that what we can do is so disproportionally small as to be as nothing, then, I think, this chapter has a word for our help. For the wise man sees that each man has his place; to each is given his own wisdom and opportunity. The scribe has leisure to read and think. But the ploughman, the artificer, the smith by his anvil, and the potter at his wheel—'all these put their trust in their hands; And each becometh wise in his own work.' They may not figure in the 'councils of the nation' but 'they will maintain the fabric of the world; And in the handywork of their craft is their prayer.' Such is his answer to the question we must all face—Why are we ordinary folk here? I think he gives three answers.

1. *To learn by experience.* We are here to grow a life. Aldous Huxley pictured for us a Brave New World where all was done for us, all comforts provided, Christianity without tears. But it did not satisfy; for struggle is the spice of life—provided it is not the whole of it. And it is not what God has provided for us. 'The Divine love does not keep us in cotton-wool.' Before very long we learn our limitations, as Moses did, 'Who am I, that I should go to Pharaoh?' without being ready to go on as he did to dedicate and use what he had. In the graphic words given to him in *Green Pastures*—'I ain't very much, but I'se all I got.' As Emerson says: 'It isn't what you have but what you do with what you have that makes the difference.' We have to do what we are told. Benjamin Franklin did as he started in his business—'Having neither wealth nor influence, he began where he could, using the tools he had.'

(*a*) Then we learn by experience the value of *Good work*—our daily task well done.

God so made life that we learn and grow by the work we do and our attitude towards it. It is the work that tests us and draws out our powers. You remember that passage in Boswell where he observes that Garrick, who was about to quit the stage, would soon have an easier life. 'I doubt that, Sir,' retorts Dr. Johnson. 'Why, Sir,' says Boswell, 'he would be Atlas with the burden off his back.' And Johnson answers him, 'But I know not, Sir, if he will be so steady without his load.'

This distinction between sacred and secular, which is one of the worst legacies of the Middle Ages, must go. It is not in the Bible. On the contrary. 'See, I have called by name Bezaleel . . . and I have filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, . . . and in all manner of workmanship . . . to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass.' That gives a new dignity to our work. And we need it, for so much work in our mechanical age is soul-destroying—by itself. It needs lifting into its place in the thought of God and its purpose in the life of man. 'All service ranks the same with God,' sang Pippa. And so it does, if it is well done. That epitaph of the man 'who cobbled shoes in this village to the glory of God for forty years,' gives a true interpretation of life's possibility for every man. Not the kind of work, but the quality of it and the way we do it—the thought of it we have in our hearts—this it is that counts.

(*b*) *A good life.* We are here to achieve the best possible life, to make the most of what we have in our hands. Here, too, 'Life gives nothing to mortals without great labour.' Yet to some the great art of life consists largely in getting away with it, in evading paying the fare. No wonder that for such there is no great depth of meaning in it. It was Macbeth, already committed to the way of vaunting ambition and self-seeking, who said life

> is a tale
> Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
> Signifying nothing.

What have you learned from the experience of life? That is the determining question. Have you learned at least this? The inadequacy of the things of sense alone, the royalty and supremacy of character, a high interpretation of trial and suffering rich with insight of their place in our development, like that of the blind 'madman,' that significant figure in Masefield's 'Good Friday' with his word,

'I have touched widsom since they took my eyes,'

and the spirit that refuses to accept any setback as final, but from failure starts on again and seeks

the help of Another and victorious One. If so, you have learnt indeed. You, too, have ' become wise in your work.' But it is time to turn to the other word of this wise man, ' they will maintain the fabric of the world.' Why, once more, are we here ?

2. *To contribute to the common pool.* Not to get so much as to give. ' A gentleman,' said Bernard Shaw once, ' is one who puts into the common stock a little more than he takes out.' It is a Biblical idea. Laban says to Jacob, ' I have learned by experience that the Lord hath blessed me for thy sake.' It is our Lord's challenge that we shall be of use. He calls us to be salt, to preserve and give tang to life ; light, to show the way to those bewildered ; servants, to lend a hand. Jesus conceived all life as stewardship. As a character in a modern novel put it : ' I've always thought of myself as something to give, not as something to hoard and be thrifty with.' ' None of us liveth unto himself,' cried Paul.

That adds a zest to life ; for there is inspiration in responsibility. Our bit may be little, but it may be the piece that completes the jigsaw of life. To feel this, that our work counts, pulls out our powers. As we work well we ' maintain the fabric of the world '—what a vocation and a challenge !

After all we *are* bound up in the bundle of life together.

> Man was made of social earth,
> Child and brother from his birth.

Everything is richer when we share it. Somebody is always listening, watching, needing. Don't be thrifty with yourself, or waste yourself. Romaine Rolland in *Jean Christophe* reveals the need when he describes the grandfather, old Jean Michel, thus : ' There were in him so many seeds of beauty and power, but they never put forth fruit. His was a nature to stop by the wayside.' But love never contracts out of life like that. Love ever gives, forgives, outlives, and stands with open hands. ' We love because he first loved us '—like that ! And so we come to journey's end in God, who put an upward reach within the heart of man. It is a greater thing than just the need of help of which this writer speaks in his concluding phrase : ' In the handywork of their craft is their prayer.' Why are we here ?

3. *To do our best as an offering to God.* The Bible is a very honest book ; you see men with all their faults. Sometimes they seem to start as small men but you see man after man flinging themselves after God and then making themselves over to Him, their whole life an offering to Him, and then they grow. They live henceforth as under His eye, in His purpose.

This is the big way of looking at life—not just piety or even prayer and worship. But all the life lived out for Him—the work and the chores, the conversation as well as the worship. ' Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business ? ' So we read and say, ' Of course ! He was the perfect Son,' and we forget how and where He did it. For twenty years He did it in the carpenter's shop at Nazareth. That lifts everybody's job and life's every day. ' In the handywork of their craft is their prayer.' But we are to do it naturally and not self-consciously. ' When you play,' said Schumann, ' do not trouble who is listening, yet always play as if a master were listening.' It is great advice—truest of all if applied to the most difficult art of life. Bishop Crotty, in his Lenten book, told of a young girl, left motherless at sixteen to care for the younger children and run the house for her father, with no church privileges and little knowledge, challenged as to what she will say to God about this when, as she was about to do, she passed on to His nearer presence. She looked down, lifted her hands, and said : ' I shall show Him my hands.'

Well, there it is, the message of this man as I see it. Is not this indeed to learn why we are here ? To learn by experience, and grow a life to contribute to the common pool, to do our best as an offering to God. If we do this, then we in our turn will help to ' maintain the fabric of the world ; and in the handywork of our craft '—in the everyday deeds of our life—' will be our prayer.'

A Document on Reunion

By Professor H. G. Wood, D.D., Birmingham

Among the papers left by T. R. Glover I have found a letter from Canon O. C. Quick on the subject of Reunion, which seems to me deserving of fuller publicity and closer consideration. As will appear, it was written in April 1926 and is a critique of the draft 'Reply to the Lambeth Appeal' which was adopted by the Baptist Union at its annual Assembly in the Spring of that year. Possibly Quick was under the impression that Glover had some hand in drawing up the document. If so, he was mistaken, as Glover had been in America when the matter was going forward. He does not, however, assume Glover's authorship. He writes on the strength of their personal acquaintance, and in the hope that his criticisms, if they impressed Glover, would carry more weight with Baptists generally.

'The Abbey, Carlisle,
'*22nd April* 1926.

'Dear Dr. Glover,—I wonder if you will allow me to presume on the strength of an acquaintance very happily inaugurated at Swanwick last Summer in order to write to you on the subject of the published "Reply to the Lambeth Appeal" which is to be presented for adoption at the forthcoming Assembly of the Baptist Union. I had been thinking of publishing some criticism of this very important document. But in view of the conceivable possibility that the document may be in some way modified before it is finally accepted and passed, I would very much prefer to write to you personally first. I imagine that if there is any possibility at all of any alteration at this late stage, published criticism from outsiders would certainly tend to remove it, and might even be regarded, not unnaturally, as unwarrantable *πολυπραγμοσύνη*. And in any case I think it may possibly interest you to know how the document strikes a rather normal Anglican who remains in general agreement with the Lambeth Appeal and with the glosses on it which have recently been made at the joint-conferences at Lambeth.

'There are two alternative methods for promoting Christian unity now under the consideration of "all Christian people." One is *Reunion*, that is, the method which proceeds by joining the various Christian denominations in *one body*,[1] with however great scope allowed for variations of worship and doctrine among different groups within the body. The other is *Federation*, that is, the method which seeks to retain many distinct and independent bodies, but would have them agree for certain practical purposes to take counsel together with a view to common action. Now Reunion and Federation, however much we may differ as to which is more in accordance with God's will, must be agreed to be alternatives which in principle exclude each other. According to the principle of Reunion, the universal Church ought here and now to be one body with a certain minimum of common organization in profession of faith and administration of sacraments, and the variations permitted must be such as to be kept within that outward unity of common order, however widely its limits are defined. According to the principle of Federation, the Church ought here and now to consist of many bodies, and such common organization as may be required for any joint-action thought to be desirable must be accepted as a measure of practical expediency, which is perhaps temporary, and must leave intact the inherent right and duty of each several body to retain its own complete independence in all matters of order and profession of faith. These two principles are incompatible. And it is as disloyal for any convinced believer in Reunion to move deliberately in the direction of Federation, as it is for any convinced believer in Federation to move deliberately towards Reunion.

'Now, if I understand the "Reply" aright, its main sum and substance is to reject the Lambeth proposals for moving towards Reunion, by declaring that the Baptist Church desires to move towards Federation. This is, of course, a perfectly relevant and legitimate answer to make, in all Christian charity, to the Lambeth Appeal. But what seems less relevant and less legitimate is that the same document, which declares all reunion-proposals to be in principle wrong, should also criticise particular proposals for Reunion, as though they had in view a doctrine of Church-unity of the Federal type. This, it seems to me, is what the "Reply" may be accused of doing.

'(1) Take its assertion that the Lambeth Appeal, by the place it gives to sacraments, excludes from the universal Church of our Lord certain bodies of devoted Christian men. Now, if by the universal Church is meant simply and only the spiritual communion and fellowship made up of "all who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity," and including members of an indefinite plurality of divided and independent bodies of believers, certainly the Lambeth Appeal would stand condemned, if it

[1] I use the word 'body' simply as a separately and independently organized Society, with no Scriptural reference.

had excluded any devoted Christian from the universal Church in that sense. But most clearly it did nothing of the kind. All believers in Reunion recognize that the one outward and "visible" Church, however true it may be that all Christians *ought* to belong to it, does not in fact, and perhaps never will, include all those who truly belong to the inward fellowship of Christ's spiritual Body. They recognize that certain devout Christians [1] are outside the universal or Catholic Church *as visibly and outwardly one*; they do *not* thereby exclude them from the spiritual fellowship of the one invisible Church, which, I take it, is the only universal Church which Baptists believe in. You may, of course, very legitimately question the value of this distinction between the visible and the invisible Church. But this is only to suggest in other words that Federation is right, and Reunion is wrong. The "Reply" therefore here quite misrepresents the Lambeth Appeal, through assuming that the Appeal conceives the unity of the Church in exactly the same way as Federalists do. This is simply a mistake.

'(2) Again: "It seems to us contrary to the simplicity that is in Christ that the full effect of the Lord's Supper as a means of grace should be held to depend on Episcopal ordination." The suggestion that this is an answer to anything said or implied in the Lambeth Appeal is quite unjustified. I don't think that most even strict Anglo-Catholics would on reflection here dissent from the Baptist proposition. (*Some* of them, I expect, would; but after all there are bad and narrow-minded theologians in every school of thought.) In any case the Lambeth Appeal was careful to exclude the smallest hint that Free Church sacraments were deficient in spiritual *efficacy*. *Validity*, of course, is a different question; for validity, in the Catholic sense, includes externals as well as spiritual gifts, and requires due form, matter, etc. No Catholic theologian maintains that a sacrament which is *invalid*, because lacking in right form and matter, is therefore *ineffective* in bringing grace. But, even as regards validity, the Anglican representatives at Lambeth have interpreted the Appeal definitely to mean that Free Church ministers are real ministers of the sacraments in the universal Church; and this must mean that Free Church sacraments are valid as affording the true outward signs as well as the true inward gifts, though possibly the externals may be in some points defective.

'(3) This leads to the question of the ministry. This the "Reply" rightly introduces with the words "Our doctrine of the Church determines our conception of the ministry"; yet it seems forthwith to forget the corollary that if the Anglican doctrine of the Church is different, Anglicans' conception of the ministry will be different too, and that therefore terms such as "validity" and "sufficiency" will very likely not mean the same thing to both sides. It is indeed evident that, if we regard the universal Church on earth as rightly consisting of many quite independent bodies, no "commissioned" ministry can have or claim a commission wider than the limits of its own body—for otherwise the bodies could not or ought not to remain quite independent in order. In that case then "a valid and sufficient ministry" must mean a ministry valid and sufficient for the exercise of its office within that independent body which commissioned it. And in this sense the "Reply" logically and rightly declares that "since God has used it (our ministry) in building up Baptist churches throughout the world which now number more than eleven million communicants, we cannot in any way deny its validity or sufficiency." But in this sense, so far as I know, none of the Anglican documents from the Appeal onwards has ever questioned the validity or sufficiency of the Baptist ministry. If, on the other hand, the Church on earth is or ought to be visibly one body and not many, a commissioned or ordained ministry must claim to be commissioned not for one independent body, but for the visible Church as a whole; and "validity and sufficiency" must mean authority to minister throughout the one Church. In this sense it is quite true that Anglican documents have questioned the validity of the Baptist ministry. But it is very difficult to see on what ground Baptists can claim *this* sufficiency, in view of the fact that apparently they do not think it to be desirable. It does not yet appear that the validity or sufficiency of the Baptist ministry has been questioned in any sense in which they have been claimed.

'(4) As to "unreserved mutual recognition." Here again we have another case of ambiguous terms. For evidently "recognition" of Church-status cannot mean quite the same to Federalists and to Reunionists. To Federalists it means the recognition of some other body, quite independent and separate in organization from their own, as entitled to an equal place with their own in a federation of many such independent bodies based upon a broad and undefined acceptance of the Christian name. To Reunionists on the other hand it must mean the recognition of another Christian body as being already with their own within the order of the one "*visible*" Catholic or universal Church, and therefore to be invited to

[1] I am not necessarily implying that such a body as the Society of Friends would on Lambeth principles be outside the *visible* Church *altogether*. But individuals undoubtedly would be in some cases.

carry out the consequences of that common membership in full reunion. It is evident that Reunionists cannot give full recognition in the Federalist sense, since it would commit them to the Federalist principle. On the other hand it is very difficult to see how Federalists can desire recognition in the Reunionist sense, since they do not believe that the one "visible" Catholic Church exists or ought to exist.

'Perhaps I have fundamentally misunderstood the whole substance and intention of the "Reply." If so, I can only ask forgiveness for having wearied you with my prejudice and stupidity. But if not, the "Reply" does seem to misrepresent and misconceive the Anglican position in certain important particulars. And it becomes a little tragic that we should be thanking God that "many ancient misunderstandings are passing away" when we are finding new ones to fill their place.

'As this letter has already reached such a merciless length, I may as well perhaps mention before I close two further points which strike my mind.

'(*a*) *Scriptures.* "These possess supreme and unique authority and we cannot give the Creeds a comparable place." Do Baptists appreciate not only the Anglican Article VI but also that every Anglican priest at ordination solemnly declares himself to be persuaded that "the holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation"? Inasmuch as the Anglican Church explicitly bases the authority of the Creeds on Scripture, it seems that there is really hardly enough ground for division here, unless the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds are held to be definitely unscriptural. Of course we none of us treat the authority of Scripture quite as the original Reformers did!

'(*b*) As a Reunionist still I find one ground of real hope in what I take to be a Federalist document—namely, the assertion that "in our judgment the baptism of infants . . . subverts the conception of the Church as the fellowship of believers." If we are really subverting the conception of the Church as a fellowship, you ought to be converting us, and then what becomes of an equal Federation? There seems to me no help for it. To say that infant-baptism is so subversive is to demand that adult-baptism should be the rule of the whole Church—it is to demand some outward unity of *order*; it is to express a desire for Reunion.

'In any case, please forgive this πολυπραγμοσύνη of mine! Whatever be the defects of Anglican orders—and I believe them in a certain sense to be real—I am not so mentally and morally defective as to suggest that the Baptist Church ought not to say fully and frankly what it thinks about the Lambeth Appeal, however adverse its judgment. But it does seem a grievous pity that great Christian Churches should discuss the problem of unity by means of public and authoritative documents which are manifestly at cross-purposes upon central issues. This is to increase the misunderstandings which we all deplore.

'Yours very sincerely,

'Oliver C. Quick.'

Glover's reply to this letter is not available, but the line he took is indicated in some notes on the envelope containing it. He queried and surely he was right in querying whether Reunion and Federation are mutually exclusive principles. For Anglicans they may be, but not for Baptists or Free Churchmen. 'Reunion in a visible church is at any rate now impossible, because our disagreements go too far down. Baptists therefore suggest Federation as a half-way house.' Canon Quick would be right, if those who advocate some form of Federation here and now, advocated it as a principle and ideal. But for the most part they do not so understand Federation. They advocate Federation not as an alternative to Reunion, but as a step towards it. Anglicans may still be apprehensive lest we should be content with some form of Federation and so the good become the enemy of the best. Yet as a matter of fact, loose forms of federal association correspond to the immediate necessities of the situation. The Ecumenical Movement itself is such a loose form of federalism.

If, however, we are discussing the terms on which Reunion may be realized, obviously Canon Quick was justified in pressing the consideration of Anglican claims regarding the ministry and the sacraments. For Federation, insistence on Episcopal ordination is irrelevant; for Reunion, it may be vital. If we reject Canon Quick's sharp antithesis of Reunion and Federation, all that he says of misunderstandings between those who are concerned with the first and those who are content with the second carries weight and should help to clarify issues in present-day discussions.

The letter does not directly deal with the outstanding issue of the present phase of the growth of the Church universal. That issue I take to be the question of inter-communion. An interchange of ministries at the Communion Table may, on Canon Quick's principle, be undesirable and prejudicial to ultimate Reunion. But it is difficult to see how any Church can legitimately exclude from the fellowship of the Lord's Table the members of other churches who are regarded here and now as true followers of the One Lord.

Contributions and Comments

Go and make ready (Luke xxii. 8, John xiv. 2)

THE fourteenth chapter of St. John's Gospel is, with the twenty-third Psalm, the passage most often turned to for comfort. When we are required to expound it, the second verse presents two difficulties: (1) the meaning of μοναί. Shall we say 'stages in a journey' or 'stopping-places where journeys end'? And (2) the sequence from 'If it were not so . . .' We are accustomed to 'I would have told you. I go . . .' But on consulting the Greek, who does not feel drawn to translate, 'If it were not so, would I have told you that I go to prepare a place for you?' We hesitate to accept this natural translation because He does not seem to have told them anything of the sort. I have come to believe that, by implication which would be clear as day to St. Peter and St. John, our Lord *had* in 13[36], just said this, about going and making ready a place for them; and that, so doing, He had indicated what manner of place (including the μοναί) it was.

The clue is to be found by relating the passage in John to the Passion narrative of Luke, which, I suggest, the writer of John had open before him, and which he doubtless assumed would be available to his readers. I set out below some indication of the influence of Lk 22 and Jn 13 and 14, not only in vocabulary but in the whole pattern of ideas. Italics mark words which are identical in the Greek.

Lk 22.	Jn 13 and 14.
1. *Now the feast* of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called *the Passover*. . . .	1. *Now* before *the feast of the Passover*. . . .
3. And *Satan entered into Judas Iscariot*. . . .	2. The devil having already put into the heart of *Judas Iscariot* . . . to *betray him* (taken up again at v. 27)
4. . . . how he might *betray him*.	27. After the sop, then *entered Satan into him*.
8A. [Jesus] sent Peter and John.	23. The disciple whom Jesus loved.
9. And they said unto him, *Where?*	24. Simon Peter.
10A. (The man with the waterpot from the well) *Follow* him.	36. Simon Peter saith unto him, Lord, *whither* goest thou? Jesus answered, Whither I go thou canst not *follow* me now, but thou shalt follow afterwards. (i.e. that is implied, which is put into words only in 14[2]).
8B. *Go and make ready for us.*	2B. *I go and make ready* a place *for you.*
10B. (Follow him), into the *house.*	2A. In my Father's *house* are many places to stay.
12. He will show you a large upper room furnished.	

It may be objected that some of these parallels are trivial—mere proper names and every-day words. There are, however, two striking little sentences: (1) 'Satan entered into Judas Iscariot' is, among the Synoptists, peculiar to Luke; and here it is, word for word in John. (2) Our Lord's command, 'Go and make ready for us,' in the Lucan passage, by a startling change of pronouns becomes in John 'I go and make ready for you.' The going and making ready, since it comes as climax in both passages, may well turn our attention to similarities in the pattern throughout. The events described by Luke and John come not many hours apart; the place and the people are the same. And twice over this is the sequence of events:

> Satan enters into Judas
> Jesus is then with Peter and John.
> From them arises the question of Where?
> The Lord's answer is concerned with following.
> In both cases the temporary separation of the two from Jesus is connected with 'going and making ready.'

May it not be that Jn 14 is meant to be interpreted in the light of Lk 22? If so, we may venture upon this paraphrase: 'In my Father's house are many places to stay, far more provision than this large upper room furnished. If it were not so, would I just now have reminded you of following the man with the waterpot, adding "You cannot follow *me* on my mission?" That mission is to be thought of just as yours was. I am going to make ready for you. And as you came back and showed me the way to this upper room, I will come again and receive you to myself, that where I am you may be also.'

Whether or no the details of this exposition are accepted, it is an exposition in line with historic fact. For the sadness of that Last Supper is transformed in His Church to joyful looking forward, to a foretaste of the Heavenlies, to Eucharist, which is Thanksgiving.

JOHN FOSTER

The University, Glasgow

Demoniac of Gadara

IN the Note in your October issue (lxiii. 2) of Dr. Weatherhead's *Psychology, Religion and Healing* you refer to the suggestion advanced by him that in the story of the healing of the demoniac of Gadara the word 'Legion' may be the key to a fuller understanding of the story. 'He may have seen some terrible slaughter carried out in some village by a Roman legion, and that childhood shock had driven him into psychosis. Possibly the repressed memories of that childhood shock were responsible for his maniacal rages.' Some interesting points arise from a study of the

story. Arnold Meyer (*Jesu Muttersprache*, 49) has pointed out that in Aramaic the word 'Legion' can mean either the body of men composing a legion or the officer commanding it. In both Mark and Luke the demon speaks of himself in the singular and therefore the latter meaning is presumably the right one. The demoniac feels himself to be possessed by one master demon who has a large number of lesser demons attending him; he speaks in their name. Mark uses the singular until the swine have been mentioned, and thereafter the plural, which is explained in 5^{9}, Λεγιὼν ὄνομά μοι, ὅτι πολλοί ἐσμεν. Luke has the singular in 8^{29} only. The alternative of one demon and many is avoided by Matthew who uses the plural throughout because there were, in his account, two demoniacs. That the question τί ὄνομά σοι may be the key to the understanding of the story is not necessarily contradicted by Matthew's omission of the question for, as Manson and Major point out (*The Mission and Message of Jesus the Messiah*) Matthew is 'generally uninterested in the details of healing.' Norval Geldenhuys in his recently published commentary on Luke says: 'The idea, however, that the man was suffering from a "trauma" contracted in childhood through witnessing the violence of a legion of soldiers is unconvincing.'

W. J. Cratchley

St. Mark's Vicarage, Swindon

Translation and the Preacher

In answer to Dr. Dunkerley's question, 'Which is the original reading and which has been altered?' (The Expository Times, lxiii. [December 1951], 77), I find on referring to my *Facsimile* copy of the First Edition of Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* that the original reading was 'but that Lock went *damnable* hard.' In another edition (containing the rare Third Part—'The Pilgrimage of Mr. Tender Conscience'—considered not to be an authentic work of Bunyan though it is exactly in his style) the words are given as 'that lock went *very* hard.' The rendering of Jn $8^{10.\ 11}$ in the Wicklyffe-Purvey version of the New Testament contains the words 'hath dampned' and 'dampned,' but even in the Middle Scots Version by Nisbet (*c.* 1520)—a version of Purvey's—the existence of which was discovered as late as about 1897 and which was reprinted by the Scots Text Society in 1901, the words have been altered to 'condampnit' and 'condampne.' In Coverdale (1535) they are 'condempned' and 'condempne.' There was, therefore, good precedent for the rendering given in the E.V. 1611. It is very unfortunate, however, that, by inconsistent renderings in English, misleading meanings have been attached to so many texts. The two Greek terms κρίνω, κατακρίνω mean respectively to judge and to judge adversely, but sometimes the one and sometimes the other has been rendered by the word 'damn' which, of course, had originally no such sinister meaning as has now come to be attached to the term. Hence the R.V. has rightly removed the word altogether from the Bible, just as the American Revised Version has entirely removed the word 'Hell,' which in English meant no more than 'the hidden or unseen place' but was used to translate Tartaros (in 2 P 2^{4}) once, Hades five times, and Gehenna fifteen times. As no idea of *endless* punishment is conveyed by any of these terms as is now conveyed by the term 'hell' it seems preferable to leave these terms untranslated. 'There is no everlasting damnation in the Talmud' (Emmanuel Deutsch, *Remains*, 53). These and many other now misleading renderings which falsify the meaning of the Greek Text of the New Testament all support the plea which I made in The Expository Times some time ago that the English Version now under preparation shall be first and foremost a *semantically* correct rendering. However good the various modern English versions may be not one of them can claim to be wholly satisfactory in this regard.

Thomas M. Donn

Duthil, Inverness-shire

Recent Foreign Theology

Congress for the History of Religions. Under the presidency of the now lamented phenomenologist G. van der Leeuw the seventh Congress for the History of Religions met in Amsterdam in September 1950, with its main theme 'Myth and Ritual,' or the question of 'patternism.' Not all of the papers were related to this general theme, which has been particularly discussed in relation to the Near Eastern field. There were eleven sections, dealing with Primitive Religion, Egypt and the Near East, the Old Testament, the Classics, the Far East and the Middle East, Islam, the Germans and the Celts, Christianity and Hellenism, Religion and the Modern World, and Phenomenology. The Proceedings of the Congress have now been published, under the editorship of the

Secretary, C. J. Bleeker, and two colleagues.[1] It contains the text of four general lectures in full. These were delivered by H. C. Puech, A. D. Nock, R. Pettazzoni, and C. J. Bleeker. That by Nock on 'Hellenistic Mysteries and Christian Sacraments' will have an interest for many in this country. The abstracts of the other papers are printed by sections, and they are clearly far too numerous to be listed here. H. Frankfort powerfully denied the whole theory of patternism[2] in one of the few papers the present writer was able to hear during a brief visit to the Congress, but patternism came back into its own in the papers of some of the Scandinavian scholars. Some who had intended to read papers, such as Gaster and Nissfeldt, were unable to attend, but the summaries of their papers are here given. The whole volume is a mine of information and especially on current positions.

Royal Accession Psalms. One of the questions connected with the Psalter that has been much discussed during the past thirty years is whether or no there was in Israel an annual royal accession festival, and whether any of the psalms were used in such a festival. An important contribution to this discussion is made in a book by H. J. Kraus on *The Kingship of God in the Old Testament*.[3] The author maintains that there was such a festival and that it had a cultic-eschatological character, and was the source of the messianic hope associated with the house of David. In the course of his work he examines in some detail a number of psalms which he believes to have been cultic lyrics used in the royal festival at Zion, namely, Pss 132, 78^{65-72}, 24 B, 2, 72, 89, 84, 87, and 122, and also the accession psalms 47, 93, 97, 99, 96, 98. The question of an accession festival is distinct from that of Divine kingship, with which it is so often associated, and of the former there is greater probability than of the latter.

Baptism and the Laying on of Hands. Professor Nikolaus Adler, of the Roman Catholic Faculty of Theology in Mainz, has published a study of Ac 8^{14-17} under the title *Baptism and the Laying on of Hands*.[4] He briefly reviews the exegesis of the passage from the Fathers to modern times, offers a literary-critical study of the passage, and inquires into the purpose and course of the visit of the Apostles to Samaria, in order to determine the relation of baptism and the laying on of hands to the gift of the Holy Spirit. The publishers state that this is not merely an exegetical study, but one that must be taken note of by dogmatic theologians and by apologists and controversialists. In this connexion it may be of interest to note that the conclusion to which the study leads is that in the Early Church there were differences of rank amongst the leaders, and that we have evidences of a hierarchy in the Church from the start. The present writer would add that we must beware of reading into those words more than they really mean. Few would fail to recognize differences of authority amongst the leaders of the Early Church. It is when we attempt to define the nature and source of that authority, and its transmission to others that disagreements remain to be resolved.

Spanish Introduction to the Bible. In the remarkable revival of Biblical studies, which is taking place in many parts of the world, Spain is not without a share. In recent years there have been several new translations of the Bible into Spanish, and a quarterly journal devoted to Biblical Studies is already in its tenth year. Various commentaries on Biblical books have been published, and now from Professor Ulecia, who is an Associate Member of the British Society for Old Testament Studies, comes a General Introduction to the Bible.[5] It does not deal with questions concerning the date and sources of the individual books of the Bible, however, but with inspiration and inerrancy, and with the text and canon of the Bible. About half the book is devoted to the text and versions, and here up-to-date information is given in a useful handbook. The excellent illustrations include plates of the Lachish Letters, of the Rylands Fragments of Deuteronomy and the Fourth Gospel, and of the Dead Sea Scrolls, including some of the fragments found in the cave.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester University

---

[1] *Proceedings of the Seventh Congress for the History of Religions*, edited by C. J. Bleeker, G. W. J. Drewes, and K. A. H. Hidding [1951]. North Holland Publishing Company, Holland.

[2] Cf. his lecture *The Problem of Similarity in Ancient Near Eastern Religions* [1951].

[3] *Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament* [1951]. Mohr, Tübingen.

[4] *Taufe und Handauflegung: eine exegetisch-theologische Untersuchung von Apg.* 8, 14–17 [1951]. Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Münster in Westf.

[5] *Introducción General a la Sagrada Biblia* [1950]. Publicaciones 'AFEBE,' Madrid.

Entre Nous

New Series

Some columns will be devoted monthly to RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. There will appear, for example, a short series on the problem of conducting children's worship, and another noting the archaeological discoveries which are important from the teacher's point of view, especially those which tend to make the Biblical text more interesting and alive for the pupil.

Arrangements are also being made for important new series on BOOKS ON THE PERSON OF CHRIST, and also on THE BEST MODERN COMMENTARIES.

Stephen Hobhouse

Forty Years and an Epilogue, by Stephen Hobhouse (James Clarke; 12s. 6d. net), is an attractive title. The words 'An Autobiography' make it doubly attractive, for of all classes of literature this is to me by far the most alluring, and the author of this merciless self-dissection was connected with many famous persons—like the Webbs, Sir Stafford Cripps, and other persons of note in public life. Stephen was the sixth 'Henry Hobhouse,' but he characteristically dropped the 'Henry' and called himself by his first name because he 'did not like the combination S. H. H.' The heads of the family were wealthy squires in a south country estate, and Stephen was born to wealth, and to an education at Eton and Oxford. Something of his future career may perhaps be due to the fact that his mother was an agnostic (and the friend of Huxley and Tyndall) and his father an Anglo-Catholic. Both were entirely out of sympathy with Stephen's passionate social conscience.

The great event in Hobhouse's spiritual and moral development was his encounter with Tolstoi's works. Tolstoi and Gandhi were the decisive factors in his career, which was almost an outdoing of both these eminent men. From them he learned nearly all that he professed and practised. He objected to wealth and renounced the possession of the family estate and income. He refused to accept dividends. He lived among the poor. He became a vegetarian. He disbelieved in the use of titles, and when he mentions somebody of note in his book he writes '(doctor) Somebody.' He was a conscientious objector and suffered imprisonment for his scruples. He was altogether and in every sphere 'again the government.' One cannot help admiring his courage, but there is something abnormal about his whole actings. I found myself repeatedly quoting the healthy observation of Ecclesiastes, 'be not righteous over much.'

F. J. RAE

Florence Allshorn

Florence Allshorn was successively a church worker in Sheffield, a missionary in Iganga in Uganda, Warden of the Church Missionary Society's St. Andrew's Hostel for the training of women missionaries, the moving spirit of several experiments in living together which finally culminated in the community of St. Julian's. Even when she was young she was an adventurous spirit. When she went to Iganga to a station which seven young missionaries had left in seven years because of an impossible colleague, she wrote to a friend, 'Thank God for something absolutely impossible,' and she performed the impossible for four years.

She must have been a tremendous though unorthodox teacher. When she came back to England she said, 'No one seems to do *much* that they don't want to do—there's no fanaticism that *does* things.' Of her students she said, 'All you can do for them is to be a sign-post to something more real.' She could be in one sense merciless. 'I believe,' she said, 'our great trouble is that we won't stir up courage to look at *failure*.' When a student came to her with a trouble or a problem her method was to say, 'What are *you* going to do about it?' rather than to try to solve it sympathetically for her. When one of her fellow-workers was going to prayer, she demanded, 'How can you go to the prayer room and leave a sink like that?'

It may be said that she had two great aims. She aimed at finding and helping others to find the secret of living together. She found that secret in Christ. 'If you are both looking at Jesus Christ,' she said, 'you can't not meet.' Her other great aim may be summed up in the one word reality. Talk was no good to her; action mattered. She said to some one with reference to an ideal, 'It is not yours until it has come out of your finger tips.'

The book is in three parts—the title is *Florence Allshorn and the Story of St. Julian's*. The first and the last parts are the work of Dr. Oldham and the second part is an account of the genesis and growth of the St. Julian's Community by Florence Allshorn herself (S.C.M.; 12s. 6d. net). We lay down the book with the comforting thought that God has still His saints in the world.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

READ AT HOME

for a London University

B.A. or B.D. DEGREE

In your leisure hours you do a certain amount of serious reading. But is this reading haphazard or is it *planned?* Has it a *definite objective?* Why not read with a view to crowning your efforts with a B.A. or B.D. Degree? Quite apart from other (and perhaps more material) advantages, the work of preparation will widen your outlook and keep you abreast with modern studies. In recent years many Ministers have taken Degrees by reading at home in their leisure hours under the experienced guidance of Wolsey Hall tutors.

LONDON B.D.: HEBREW NO LONGER COMPULSORY
Candidates may obtain a *Pass* at B.D. without offering Hebrew, but this subject is compulsory for those seeking Honours. If you are interested please mention B.D. when writing for Prospectus.

Open to all

London University Degrees are open to all, without the necessity of going into university residence or attending lectures. It is necessary only to pass three examinations (in some cases *two*). You can read for these at home without interfering with your pastoral duties.

Wolsey Hall Postal Courses

For these examinations are prepared and individually conducted by a staff of more than 100 University Graduate Tutors. The Courses comprise Lessons, Test Papers, Model Answers, correction of your work and solution of *all* difficulties by your tutors. A guarantee is given that in case of failure, tuition will be continued *free*. Tuition fees are very reasonable and may be paid by instalments.

Write (mentioning examination or Degree) for Prospectus, post free from C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D., Director of Studies, Dept. GE 20,

Wolsey Hall, Oxford

EPWORTH SECONDHAND BOOKS
Established 1747
Specialists in Theological Books
ENQUIRIES INVITED
25-35 CITY ROAD, LONDON, E.C.1

WE HAVE PLEASURE IN ANNOUNCING THAT WE HAVE NOW PUBLISHED

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON

THE BOOKS OF KINGS

(INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY)

By the late Professor
JAMES A. MONTGOMERY
Ph.D., S.T.D., D.H.L., Litt.D.

Edited and completed by Professor
HENRY S. GEHMAN
Ph.D., S.T.D., Litt.D., Princeton.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: MODERN BIBLE TRANSLATIONS: CHRONOLOGY: CARTOGRAPHY: INSCRIPTIONS, EPIGRAPHS, ETC., COMMONLY CITED: KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS: SYMBOLS IN THE CRITICAL APPARATUS: INTRODUCTION:—The Book; Ancient Versions; Grouping of the Versions; The Sources of the Book: COMMENTARY: INDEXES.

xlviii + 576 pages — 35s. net

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS NEW YORK — **T. & T. CLARK** EDINBURGH

Again Available

Supplies of the Following Titles:

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. Edited by Dr. JAMES HASTINGS. Volumes VIII and XIII. Cloth, each 50s. net

DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS. Edited by Dr. JAMES HASTINGS. Volumes I and II. Cloth, each 45s.

(International Critical Commentary)

JOB. Professors S. R. DRIVER and BUCHANAN GRAY. 28s.

PSALMS, Vol. II. Professor C. A. BRIGGS and E. G. BRIGGS. 20s.

EZEKIEL. Canon G. A. COOKE. 28s.

MICAH, ZEPHANIAH, NAHUM, HABAKKUK, OBADIAH and JOEL. Professors J. M. P. SMITH, W. H. WARD and J. A. BEWER. 20s.

ROMANS. Professor W. SANDAY and Right Rev. A. C. HEADLAM. 20s.

I CORINTHIANS. Right Rev. A. ROBERTSON and Dr. A. PLUMMER. 20s.

REVELATION, Vol. II. Ven. Archdeacon R. H. CHARLES. 28s.

(International Theological Library)

HISTORY OF RELIGIONS, Vol. II. Professor G. F. MOORE. 20s.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. Prof. G. P. FISHER. 20s.

THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER. Principal A. E. GARVIE. 24s.

38 GEORGE STREET **T. & T. CLARK** EDINBURGH 2

WHEN TIMES ARE HARD

and anxiety is the undercurrent in most lives, it is not surprising that there should be signs of increasing attention to what is permanent and secure. We cannot venture to speak for more than one segment of awareness inside our country's life, or to lay an undue stress on the permanence of our publications. At least we can say that we have noticed, in the most mundane form of increased sales, a growing interest in serious books; and we believe that most of our publications point, with more or less clarity and power, to the source of permanence in our Christian faith.

We are publishing so many books at present that we can only mention a few of the titles Jacques Ellul's **The Presence of the Kingdom** (8s 6d net) is an outstanding effort by a French layman to see our predicament in the light of biblical truth. John McNeill's *magnum opus* is now ready: **A History of the Cure of Souls** (25s net). There is a little group of work by Anglican scholars which will break down barriers William Nicholls' **Ecumenism and Catholicity** (12s 6d net) will advance the hopes of a real οἰκουμένη; Kathleen Bliss's **The Service and Status of Women in the Churches** (12s 6d net) and Sherwin Bailey's **The Mystery of Love and Marriage** (12s 6d net) supply respectively well-documented facts, and an essay in the theology of sexual relation

There are briefer works also of outstanding interest: C H. Dodd's Burge Memorial Lecture **Christianity and the Reconciliation of the Nations** (3s 6d net); Canon Raven's **Science and the Christian Man** (4s 6d net), and Bishop Stephen Neill's **Christian Partnership** (7s 6d net) continue the good work The best advice we can give is to write for our Spring List in which these and other new books are fully described.

SCM PRESS

56 Bloomsbury Street London WC1

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post. Entered as Second-Class Matter 15th March. 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH *Annual Subscription, including postage, 19s. 6d. net.*

AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON, E.C.4. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE ABERDEEN. *Rates—£9. 9s. per page: smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 6th of the previous month.*